# STUDIES IN LUCIAN'S COMIC FICTION

# MNEMOSYNE

## BIBLIOTHECA CLASSICA BATAVA

COLLEGERUNT
W. DEN BOER • W. J. VERDENIUS • R. E. H. WESTENDORP BOERMA
BIBLIOTHECAE FASCICULOS EDENDOS CURAVIT
W. J. VERDENIUS, HOMERUSLAAN 53, ZEIST

SUPPLEMENTUM QUADRAGESIMUM TERTIUM

GRAHAM ANDERSON

# STUDIES IN LUCIAN'S COMIC FICTION

LUGDUNI BATAVORUM E. J. BRILL MCMLXXVI

# STUDIES IN LUCIAN'S COMIC FICTION

BY

GRAHAM ANDERSON

LUGDUNI BATAVORUM E. J. BRILL MCMLXXVI

ISBN 90 04 04760 3

*Copyright 1976 by E. J. Brill, Leiden, Netherlands*

*All rights reserved. No part of this book may be reproduced or translated in any form, by print, photoprint, microfilm, microfiche or any other means without written permission from the publisher*

PRINTED IN THE NETHERLANDS

*To the memory of*

*Erwin Rohde and B. E. Perry*

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Preface . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . IX

I. *Verae Historiae* . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . 1
A. Antonius Diogenes . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . 1
B. The Composition of *Verae Historiae* . . . . . . . 7

II. *Toxaris* and *Philopseudes* . . . . . . . . . . . . . 12
A. Toxaris . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . 12
B. Philopseudes . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . 23

III. The *Onos*: The Greek Frame-Story . . . . . . . . . . 34
A. Lucianic Themes . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . 36
B. Structure . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . 40
C. Humour . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . 42
D. Style . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . 42
E. The Two Greek Versions . . . . . . . . . . . . 44
F. The Source of the Ass-Romance? . . . . . . . . . 46

IV. The *Onos*: The Inserted Tales . . . . . . . . . . . 50
A. Some Questions of Method . . . . . . . . . . . 50
B. The Tale of Aristomenes (I.2-20) . . . . . . . . 54
C. Lucius and Pytheas (I.24 f.) . . . . . . . . . . 55
D. The Tale of Diophanes (II.14) . . . . . . . . . 56
E. Thelyphron (II.18-30) . . . . . . . . . . . . . 57
F. The Risus-Festival (II.31-III.18) . . . . . . . . 59
G. The Robbers' Tales (IV.8-22; VII.6-8) . . . . . 61
H. The Tale of Charite (VIII.1-14); Varia. . . . . . 63
I. Miscellaneous Tales of Adultery and Intrigue (IX-X) . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . 64
J. Possibilities . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . 66

V. *De Dea Syria* . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . 68
A. The 'Lucianic' Themes . . . . . . . . . . . . . 69
B. 'Lucianic' Humour? . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . 72
C. The Story of Kombabos (19-26) . . . . . . . . . 78
D. The Account of the Rites (49-60) . . . . . . . . 81

VI. Points of Contact: Ideal Romance and its Fringes . . 83
A. Lucian and the Ideal Romance . . . . . . . . . 83
B. The *Life of Apollonius* . . . . . . . . . . . . 89
C. Dio's *Euboicus* . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . 94

VII. Points of Contact: Comic Novel and Comic Tale? . . 99
A. Contacts with the *Satyricon*? . . . . . . . . . 99
B. *P Oxy. 3010* . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . 106
C. Lucian and the *Milesiaca* . . . . . . . . . . . 108

VIII. Conclusion . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . 115

Select Bibliography . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . 121

Index of Authors cited . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . 127

Index of Proper Names . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . 134

# PREFACE

The ancient novel has received much attention from scholars. In recent years the rather unconventional sophist Lucian has been equally fortunate. But although Lucian lived in the boom of novel-writing and enjoyed rhetorical fiction, scholars have seldom attempted to relate a versatile author to an elusive genre. It is perhaps unwise to mix the study of Lucian, rich in scholarly certainties, with problems so treacherous that recantations may soon equal original contributions. Certainly anyone who dabbles in the study of the *Onos* can expect to pay the price for his *curiositas*. In general Lucianic scholars have known better: Jacques Bompaire simply dismisses the Greek novel as unworthy of Lucian's attention: any overlap between the two must be incidental, since Lucian shared the same rhetorical education as the novelists themselves. At the same time Bompaire wisely avoided the *Onos*, on which much of Lucian's involvement with the novel would depend. In scholarship on the novel itself Lucian is equally liable to be dismissed: B. E. Perry recognised his claim to the *Onos*, but tried to keep Lucian's novels in a class by themselves, well outside the mainstream of ancient fiction. Meanwhile Lucian's own reputation in other fields has helped to divert attention both from the novels proper and from his romantic tales. My aim in this study is to explore a number of points of contact between Lucian and the traditions open to him, with a view to throwing some light on both. First I have examined the five major works of fiction attributed to him. Here I have followed the approach in my *Lucian: Theme and Variation in the Second Sophistic*, by reading each work in the context of Lucian's literary techniques as well as tracing his alleged sources. This procedure has been very sparingly applied in the past to the *Onos* and *de Dea Syria*; it has been almost totally ignored by writers on *Toxaris*, *Philopseudes* and *Verae Historiae*, so that Lucian's ability to manipulate themes and motifs is often left out of account. Secondly, I have considered some points of contact between Lucian's repertoire as a whole and writers of Ideal and Comic Romance. He is difficult to place in relation to almost any other writer, let alone the development of the novel; but his work can be used to test some of the many generalisations which have been offered. If the

conclusions are often sceptical or uncommitted, there are some compensations in drawing Lucian and the novel closer together. In the first place, he may well be the only ancient writer to have left us more than one work in the genre. And among writers of fiction he is certainly the author we know most about, because of the vast bulk of writings which survived him: hence his scope and intentions are much easier to understand than those of Petronius, Apuleius, or perhaps even Longus. Moreover Lucian is indispensable to the study of Antonius Diogenes; his name is entangled somehow or other in the chaotic problems of the Ass-Romance; he must have been aware of the Greek Ideal Romance even if he avoids its main theme; he has a double connexion with Petronius, since he has experience of Menippean Satire as well as Comic Romance; and a number of other curious byeways in ancient fiction lead inexorably to and from him. Each of these connexions entails quite separate problems, some of them now well beyond any reasonable hope of final solution; my object is to show that Lucian's contribution is a far more important part of the evidence than has been recognised hitherto, and that the role of literary *plasma* by highly versatile sophists is still an important consideration in a field increasingly given over to oriental mythologising. The study of Lucian does not always break the deadlock; too often it shows us why an impasse already reached is likely to remain an impasse for the foreseeable future—and that is equally important.

It is now a century since Erwin Rohde's *Griechische Roman* set scholarship on the ancient novel along a new path. Serious literary study of the *Onos* began with Goldbacher just before (1872), that of Lucian with Croiset just after (1882). Since then the three paths have crossed only once—in the work of B. E. Perry, whose publications on the *Onos* began at the half-century. Once more the ass is at the cross-roads.

This work is intended as a sequel to *Lucian: Theme and Variation in the Second Sophistic*. My thanks are due to Donald Russell, Ewen Bowie, Malcolm Macleod and Bryan Reardon, all of whom have read parts of this work at some stage and discussed the novel with me. In a field where caution is rare I owe any I may retain to them. I am also grateful to Peter Parsons, who encouraged me to make a brief excursion into the no-man's land of the Greek *Satyricon*; and to my wife, who supported and shared my fascination for Lucius.

University of Kent at Canterbury, GRAHAM ANDERSON
November 1975

## CHAPTER ONE

# *VERAE HISTORIAE*

Lucian's *Verae Historiae* can claim to be the least problematic of ancient novels. He makes it clear to the reader that he is writing parody on the grand scale, and invites him to recognise the sources: Stengel [1] has already established a respectable proportion of them. But there are two underlying problems which Lucian did not invite us to solve: how did he use Antonius Diogenes, and how far is he relying on his usual habits of composition?

### A. ANTONIUS DIOGENES

Lucian tells us that his victims are too well-known to require any further explanation, and names only three authors; we are left to guess the rest. None of those he names are novelists: apart from Homer we are given only Ctesias and Iambulus, a dubious historian and a fanciful geographer. But both the scholia and the Byzantine patriarch Photius connected him with a novel by one Antonius Diogenes, the τὰ ὑπὲρ Θούλην ἄπιστα: Photius describes it briefly,[2] and claims that it was the πηγὴ καὶ ῥίζα of *Verae Historiae*. Until recently the problem remained as Photius left it: scholars had to be content with discerning Antonius dimly through the pages of Lucian. Stengel noted a few points where the summary does correspond neatly to Lucian's parodies, but only within the framework of a vast literary mosaic embracing most classical authors.[3] In 1969 however K. Reyhl published an extensive investigation of Antonius,[4] based on a much fuller set of sources, including Porphyry's *Vita* of Pythagoras, and papyrus fragments unknown to Stengel. The result

[1] A. Stengel, *De Luciani veris historiis*, Diss. Rostock, Berlin 1911. Ollier's *Érasme* edition, though a school text, is also occasionally useful. For *Verae Historiae* in the context of Lucian's fantasy as a whole, see Bompaire 658-673.

[2] Phot. *Cod.* 166.

[3] Only four seem to me to be distinctive: the description of the moon itself (Stengel 19); living on dew (34); miraculous eyesight (37); and nights a whole year long (58).

[4] K. Reyhl, *Antonios Diogenes, Untersuchungen zu den Roman-Fragmenten der 'Wunder jenseits von Thule' und zu den 'Wahren Geschichten' des Lukian*, Diss. Tübingen 1969.

is an ambitious reconstruction, in which he concludes that *VH* is much more extensively dependent on Antonius than has hitherto been supposed. My purpose is to test this assertion against what can be known of Lucian's own sources and methods.

Reyhl has used Lucian to reconstruct Antonius in much the same way as Helm had used him to re-create Menippus. He is content to see the *Urquelle* everywhere, and he will cite an obscure intermediary when there is a parallel readily available in the school reading of both Lucian and his audience. But in any case Lucian persistently contaminates his sources—that is all part of the fun—and these sources include his own stock of themes and motifs. One example will suffice. In *VH* I.7 f. Lucian is writing about a river of wine and magic vinewomen. Reyhl argues that his source is 'offensichtlich eine Indienbeschreibung' (36)—so that Antonius ought to have included one as well! So indeed he might. But Lucian had a particular affection for Herodotus, and could expect his audience to recognise allusions to IV.9 (Heracles and the Scythian seductress) and I.108 (the womb of Mandane)—neither of them set in India: transporting them from Scythia or Persia is part of the game. And these are only two out of many hints in this fruitful passage; [5] Lucian's habits have to be kept in mind throughout.

The highlight of his first book is a battle among the stars (I.14-20). Reyhl supposes that this too should have been borrowed from Antonius (39). Now Photius mentions that the latter included a sibylline prophecy[6] as well as a voyage to the moon: Reyhl wants to fit the cosmic battle into the prophecy, since oracles are known to contain episodes of this kind! But so is Hellenistic poetry: one need look no further than Catullus 66.93 f. Since R. himself points out that the theme recurs in Seneca (*ad Marciam* XXVI.4; *Herc. Fur.* 944-52), it is not possible to establish that Lucian's access to it could only have been through Antonius. And he was well able to consult prophecies through many other sources, including Alexander of Abonoteichos; but even so he had no need to look there to find such a battle. Comic engagements are one of his favourite devices in any unlikely context, from the gymnasium at Athens to the inside of the whale's stomach.[7] He could easily have produced this partic-

[5] For the rest, see my *Lucian: Theme and Variation in the Second Sophistic, Mnemosyne* Suppl. XLI, 27 f.

[6] *Cod.* 166.110a.

[7] For other examples, *Theme and Variation* 36 ff.

ular example by conflating three passages direct from his favourite comedies. At Ar. *Nub.* 346 Strepsiades remembers seeing clouds shaped like centaurs; at *Av.* 550 ff. there is to be a blockade of cloud, on which Lucian models his own version at *VH* I.19; and at *Pax* 205 Trygaeus arrives in heaven to find that War is in command: this is particularly close to the situation here, where Lucian himself goes up to find Endymion about to make war on the sun. It is again typical of Reyhl's method (41) to refer the Nephelokentauroi (I.16) to an oriental source: he ignores the *Clouds* altogether, although in *Prom. es* 6 Lucian quotes quite specifically from the scene previous to Strepsiades' discussion of Cloud-centaurs; the same arguments apply against his sources for the flying vultures (43).[8] He characteristically notes that Lucian's aerial cavalry are armed with helmets of bean and breastplates of lupine, while those of the Apocalypse of John (IX.17) have breastplates of fire (θώρακας πυρίνους); and he ingeniously gives Lucian a pun on θερμός/θέρμος. This would be easier to prove if there were not already a pun on πύρινος (fiery, wheaten) which Lucian would have missed. But again Lucian had much easier access to this sort of detail through the *Batrachomuiomachia*,[9] with its comic catalogue of armaments made of the most unlikely materials. Again, the trumpeter in Lucian's battle is an ass (17): Reyhl looks for this detail in Eratosthenes' *Katasterismoi* (42). But elsewhere Lucian indulges his liking for Herodotus,[10] and this very detail duly occurs at IV.129; we need look no further.

Lucian describes life on the moon at some length (I.22 ff.). Reyhl produces an ingenious mosaic of passages from Michael of Ephesus, John Lydus, and the *Orphica*[11] to suggest what Antonius should have contained, and compares Lucian's description of the birth and death of the moonmen: they are held in the wind at birth, and they dissolve into the air. But Lucian can obtain his Pythagorica through rather different channels. Elsewhere he exploits the Platonic myths intensively: for details of this kind he need go no further than *R.* 621B (souls swirled up, φέρεσθαι, in an earthquake to be born) and *Phaedr.* 250C (disembodied souls). The moonmen also have a pecu-

[8] For other vultures in Lucian, cf. *Theme and Variation* 28 f., 52 f.

[9] For his use of it, see Hermann, *AC* 18 (1949), 359 ff.

[10] See cc. II and V *infra.*

[11] Michael of Ephesus, *In Arist. de Generatione animalium*, ed. M. Hayduck, 1903, 159 f.; John Lydus I.5; *Orphica* cited in Arist. *de Anima* I.5.410b.

liar diet, and Stengel compared several fragments of Megasthenes. Again Reyhl is forced to argue (47) that these should still have come through Antonius: but why should Lucian not have known Megasthenes directly, as he knew Ctesias? Nor is there any good reason to refer the bald men on the moon (I.23) to Antonius (Reyhl 48). Lucian is always interested in the hair as an 'ethnographic' detail:[12] he was also familiar with Herodotus IV.28, where there is room for bald men among the Scythians; in the eyes of so versatile a writer one exotic place is very much like another.

At *VH* I.26 Lucian describes a well on the moon from which one can see the earth in an overhead mirror. Here Reyhl is on firmer ground (49): the Pythagoreans could indeed interpret the moon as a mirror; and he also cites a similar contraption in *Icar.* 26, where Zeus has a well-opening from heaven as a peephole down to earth. Did Lucian then conflate a detail from Antonius with a previous parody of his own? Again however the moon as a mirror is available through his standard sources (*Nub.* 479 ff.; cf. Pl. *Phaedr.* 250B—divine justice seen through a glass darkly). And there are other ingredients from his usual stock: he ascribes a *bon mot* to his teacher Demonax, in which the philosopher sees the Antipodes through a well (*Dem.* 22), while in Pl. *Theaet.* 174A the foolish star-gazer Thales falls down one. And there is yet another passage in Herodotus (IV.81), where Scythia is the setting for an eccentric structure—a giant bronze bowl. Lucian was perfectly capable of transferring this (reflecting) disc to the moon and conflating it with the well-worn joke about the well.

In *VH* I.30 Lucian is swallowed by a whale, and he meets a father and son inside. Here too Reyhl's argument is attractive: a known source of Antonius, Antiphanes of Berge, did indeed use the motif of the whale (52). But we cannot go on to infer that Lucian's pair, Scintharus and Cinyras, correspond to Antonius' Deinias and Demochares. Lucian can easily invent fathers and sons as required, to suit the purposes of his narrative.[13] And the scene is also a familiar topos anyway: time and again his narrator meets a stranger in some exotic place, and he turns out in due course to be a friend.[14]

Reyhl (52) notes that Scintharus later sprouts hair (II.41); and

[12] E.g. *Navig.* 2 f.; *Tox.* 51.

[13] Eucrates' sons, *Philops.* 27; Eucritus' son, *Conv.* 5. In this case Cinyras will be needed later on: he is to rape Helen at II.25 f.

[14] See *Theme and Variation* 109 ff.

that such a motif occurs elsewhere in conjunction with adventures in a whale: he argues that it probably occured in Antiphanes as well. But in Lucian this motif is widely separated from the whale—by the space of a whole book. It may happen to Scintharus simply because he is the only named person available at this point in the narrative, and proper names help to create the impression of precision in tall stories. Moreover *VH* is full of sprouting objects (a ship's figurehead and mast, sprouting men, beards above the knee);[15] even this ingenious connexion is not proven.

After escaping from the whale, Lucian turns his ship into a land-yacht and sails over the ice (II.2). Now Antonius did deal with northern latitudes, and we should expect a parody here if anywhere. But that is not a reason for rejecting Stengel's parallel from Herodotus IV.28, where the Scythians cross frozen seas in their wagons (Reyhl 53 n. 1): Lucian knew this stretch of Herodotus well, and imitates it intensively in *Toxaris*. It is also worthwhile to note that gliding over fantastic surfaces is another motif which he uses elsewhere: his own ship glides over a sea of treetops, Homer's horses glide over the flowers, or one of his Hyperboreans walks on the water.[16] Lucian also sails on a sea of milk to the Isles of the Blest (II.4). Even if this is a parody of the milky way leading to Elysium, as Reyhl argues, it might still derive directly from popular Pythagorean doctrine. But such a parody would be more in place in I, where Lucian is among the stars: here he has already left them behind for half a book, and the allusion might too easily be missed. In any case it is tempting to see the Sea of Milk as a mere doublet of the river of wine at I.7 f.

On this sea Lucian meets sailors with corks attached (II.4). Reyhl (54) compares details in Plutarch's myth in *de Genio Socratis* 590F, 592A, where the dancing star-souls are compared to the corks on fishermen's nets. But the corks may simply be a realistic development for their own sake: since Reyhl is also able to cite several Anthology epigrams on the subject (VI.27-29, 90, 192), Lucian has once more another equally accessible source. And he had also a large repertoire of fishing similes, often developed in a resourceful way:[17] this passage may be the product of his own imagination. And again a glance across to Book I may suggest a source: the base

[15] II.41; I.22; I.23.
[16] *VH* II.42; *Philops.* 3; *ibid.* 13.
[17] *Theme and Variation* 30, 122.

of cork is a natural counterpart to the roots of vine in I.8,[18] and Lucian was interested in any means of walking on the water and any kind of curious footwear.[19]

He next describes the Isles of the Blest at great length. But he is very fond of such topics elsewhere,[20] and he has taken the opportunity over his work as a whole to parody a wide cross-section of Utopia literature. In view of this Reyhl seems quite unconvincing when he attempts to explain II.5-28 more or less systematically in terms of one Pythagorean hint or another, especially when he admits that Lucian has used a piece of *popular* Pythagoreanism here (II.24), and that Pythagoras is in any case one of his commonest butts (58). In II.16-17 Lucian very obviously parodies the Platonic myths [21] (especially for the list of heroes, cf. *R.* 620A ff.); it seems pointless to insist on Orphic-Pythagorean doublets for them (Reyhl 65). The source for the sexual customs in II 19 f. is even more obvious: Lucian always associates wife-sharing with Plato,[22] and sibylline parallels are irrelevant. In II.20 he has a scholarly conversation with Homer. It is simply perverse to wish this on Antonius (Reyhl 66): it is clearly a sophistic theme in its own right, as shown by the lengthy development in Philostratus' *Heroicus*, where a vinedresser in the Troad questions the ghosts of Homeric heroes about the veracity of their poet. Moreover Lucian himself develops such scenes in several contexts elsewhere: Lycinus talks to Hesiod and Menippus interviews Homeric heroes;[23] again he needs no further incentive.

It is quite clear from the above cases that we cannot even attempt to use Lucian to reconstruct Antonius. Reyhl has often noted short sequences of themes which *may* point to some association of ideas which is vaguely 'Pythagorean', or which for some other reason occurred in Antonius; but we can go no further, especially when Lucian is so obviously engaging in parody rather than plagiarism. We know that Antonius included a passage on Pythagoreanism:[24]

---

[18] *Ibid.* 28; *infra* 8.

[19] *Theme and Variation* 44, cf. 93.

[20] Cf. *Icar.* 27 f. (heavenly entertainments); *Neky.* 15; *Luct.* 7; *Philops.* 24; Bompaire 663 ff.

[21] For Lucian's intensive use of Plato, see W. H. Tackaberry, *Lucian's relation to Plato and the post-Aristotelian Philosophers, University of Toronto Studies, philological series* IX, 1930.

[22] *Conv.* 39; *Vit. Auct.* 17.

[23] *Hes.*; *D. Mort. passim.*

[24] Phot. *Cod.* 166.109b.

but this need not imply that the whole novel was in any sense 'Pythagorean'—any more than Ovid's *Metamorphoses* is 'Pythagorean' on account of the patently rhetorical sermon on the subject in XV.75 ff. The Pythagorean discourse in Antonius is set clearly in perspective by Photius: it is a reported conversation between Astraeus and Dercyllis, set between her return from Hades and a description of miraculous eyesight; there is no reason to regard it as anything other than a decorative interlude in line with the other exotica that pervade the book—necromancies, sorceries, and all the other sensational paraphernalia so familiar from Photius' summary of Iamblichus.[25]

We can see equally well from Philostratus' fully extant *Life of Apollonius* just how little this kind of material often amounts to: even in a pious tribute to a superstitious empress it is the most perfunctory window-dressing. There is almost nothing in the Pythagoreanism of Apollonius that Lucian could not have taken from an educated person's common knowledge and ridiculed in *Vitarum Auctio*. We might suspect that Antonius' novel was no different from the *Life* in that respect, and that Lucian would scarcely have needed to rely on Antonius for his 'knowledge' of Pythagoreanism. This is not to say that he would not have used him whenever the opportunity arose: he will thicken the texture of his literary pastiche with as many converging authors as possible; but there is no cause to promote Antonius above Herodotus, Ctesias, or Aristophanes. Lucian's parodies are too complex to leave room for single-source theories—especially when the source in question has left so few other traces.[26]

## B. THE COMPOSITION OF *VERAE HISTORIAE*

A far more promising source of *Verae Historiae* has been equally neglected in the past. Elsewhere Lucian shows that he has a taste for 'parallel composition', so that incidents in one work can be shown to 'balance' those in another in almost the same order. I have shown elsewhere how this affects the arrangement of whole dialogues such as *Icaromenippus* and *Nekyomanteia* or *Timon* and

[25] Phot. *Cod.* 94.

[26] R. Merkelbach uses the summary of Antonius as further proof of his theory of the religious origins of the novel (*Roman und Mysterium in der Antike*, Munich 1962, 225-233). Antonius accordingly becomes a mystery text like the rest. Whatever view one takes of Merkelbach's theory as a whole, such an interpretation cannot rest on so cursory a report by Photius.

*Piscator.*[27] If Lucian used the same technique in *VH*, then we have an entirely new insight into the principles governing his selection of material.

It is generally assumed that he made no effort to organise the fantastic travels in *VH*. Croiset saw only 'une chaîne d'événements presque indéfinie; ces événements ne sont soumis à aucune loi . . . les incidents se succèdent avec une prodigalité inépuisable . . . '; and he despaired of further analysis.[28] Hirzel noticed the basic contrast between heaven and Hades, which he compared to the symmetry of *Icar.* and *Neky.*;[29] and others have detected a few parallel passages.[30] It is worth noting that some of these doublets occupy similar positions in their respective books: we should examine the arrangement of incidents overall.

Both books have a similar shape: Lucian begins with a few casual incidents, describes his main stopping-place in greater detail, then resumes with a longer series of minor happenings. The details bear out this basic symmetry, and are best seen in tabular form. Elsewhere he can depart discreetly from his schemes to pursue a point in one of his models, or to smooth out the succession of topics slightly. Here I have italicised those episodes in Book II which fall a little out of line with their counterparts in I.

*A: Preliminaries*

| Book I | | Book II | |
|---|---|---|---|
| 5: | The crew prepare to sail. | 1f.: | The crew prepare to sail. |
| 7: | L. measures footprints. | 2: | L. measures corpses. |
| | | | *An unusual kind of fishing (digging fish out of ice).* |
| | L. navigates a river of wine. | 3: | L. navigates a sea of milk. |
| | An unusual kind of fishing (fish full of vine-lees). | | Vines full of milk. |
| 8: | Women with roots of vine. | 4: | Men with feet of cork. |

*B: The main episode*

| | | | |
|---|---|---|---|
| 9-28: | The moon. | 4-29: | The Islands of the Blest. |
| 9: | Whirlwind. | 5: | Breeze of fragrance. |
| 10: | Position of the islands. | 6: | Position of the islands. |

---

[27] *Theme and Variation* 139-145.

[28] *Essai sur la vie et les oeuvres de Lucien,* Paris 1882, 371 f.

[29] *Der Dialog II*, Leipzig 1895, 317.

[30] Stengel (*o.c.* 87) notes sailing on ice (II.2)/on trees (II.42); Lamptown (I.29)/Dream-island (II.32 ff.). For the internal symmetry of these last two episodes, see *Theme and Variation* 25 f. Bompaire adds the fantastic weather at I.17, 24/II.14 (670 n. 1).

| | | | |
|---|---|---|---|
| 11: | L's crew are arrested by hippogyps. | 6: | L's crew are bound with rose-chains. |
| 11: | L. before Endymion. | 6-10: | before Rhadamanthys. |
| | | 11-16: | *Customs on the islands.* |
| 13-16: | Tribes on sun and moon. | 17-21: | Individuals on the islands. |
| 17-19: | Battle episode. | 22-23: | Games and battle episode. |
| 19-20: | Council and parody treaty. | 24: | Trial and parody epic. |
| 21: | L. leaves after a dubious proposal of marriage. | 25-27: | L. leaves after one of his crew has a scandalous affair. |
| 22-26: | Customs on the moon. | | |
| 26: | L. sees his past home. | 27: | L. sees his future home. |
| 27: | L. receives gifts. | 28: | L. receives a talisman. |

*C: Other adventures*

| | | | |
|---|---|---|---|
| 28-29: | L. lands on the morning star, but passes Nephelokokkygia. | 29 f.: | L. lands on Tartarus, but passes other islands. |
| | | | *He looks into Tartarus and sees the candlefish.* |
| | He sees the truthful Aristophanes. | 31: | He sees the liars Herodotus and Ctesias. |
| 29: | Lychnopolis. | 32-35: | Dream-islands. |
| 30: | L. is swallowed by a whale, and finds fish and birds inside. | | |
| 33-36: | L's meeting with Scintharus. | 35-36: | L's meeting with Calypso. |
| 37-39: | A land-battle inside the whale. } | 37: | A three-way engagement: L. v. Kolokuntopeiratai; he looks on while they fight the Karuonautai. |
| 40-42: | L's men look on at a naval battle. } | | |
| 40: | Miraculous floating islands. | 40: | A miraculous floating island (a kingfisher's nest). |
| | They have treetops for sails. | 41: | L's ship's mast sprouts into foliage. |
| II.2: | L. escapes from the whale and resumes his adventures. | | |
| | He sails on a sea of ice. | 42: | He sails on treetops. |
| 3: | Bulls with horns below the eyes. | 44: | Bull-headed men. |
| | | 45: | *Ships with* αἰδοῖα *as masts.* |
| 4: | Men with feet of cork. | 45: | Chariots of cork. |
| | | 46: | *L. escapes from a trap and resumes his adventures.* |

This conspectus shows that Lucian has sustained his two parallel chains of incidents for even longer than in *Icar.* and *Neky.* The two columns overlap slightly, and do not correspond exactly to the book-divisions: I.5-42 + some incidents in II.1-4 balances the remaining incidents in II.1-4 + II.5-47. As in *Icar.-Neky.* there are breaks in sequence, but they can be explained from the nature of

Lucian's material: once more he departs from the scheme no more than he has to.[31]

This degree of parallelism raises an important question about Lucian's sources: did he invent incidents in one book simply to correspond to those in the other? Scholars have usually assumed [32] that every incident has to be a parody of *something* because Lucian has said so (I.2). But liars extraordinary are not always the most trustworthy guides to their own work. There are certainly cases where Lucian has been able to find parallel 'authority' for a pair of incidents: Lychnopolis and Dreamland are obvious examples.[33] But in some such cases he may have allowed a preconceived scheme to influence his choice of episodes for parody: he may have chosen to include a sea of treetops (II.42) not only for the parody it affords, but because it 'balances' the sea of ice (II.2),[34] and varies a nearby incident (I.40) where the treetops are sails and not sea. And it is incredible that Lucian should have been able to find models for every aspect of every incident: the grotesque phallonauts (II.45) probably owe something to Aeolocentaur's ships (I.40) and the Phellopodes (II.4). And Lucian sometimes uses his parallel pairs to parody the same material twice over: St. Elmo's fire is part of his nautical repertoire,[35] and it is too good to use only once. In *VH* II.41 the ship's mast sprouts fruit instead of flame, while at I.40, in the 'corresponding' situation, the crew have flames instead of hair.

How did Lucian arrive at his scheme? He could have planned the work as a whole, but divided it into books on the grounds that any λόγος ἱστορικός ought to have *some* book-division. He may then have placed similar motifs as far apart as possible, to avoid repeti-

---

[31] The Islands of the Blest are not a likely place for a battle, so that Lucian expands his description of the inhabitants and includes only a short one (II.23) towards the end of his account. In I he visits Lychnopolis *before* being swallowed by the whale, but places the corresponding stay in Dreamland *after* his visit to Tartarus: this is due to natural association of ideas, since Lychnopolis, his own 'answer' to Nephelokokkygia, could scarcely be placed *inside* the whale; and on the other hand one expects a direct transition from the Isles of the Blest to Tartarus. There are a number of minor incidents set inside the whale, but it would have been difficult to place corresponding ones in Tartarus; and it may be that by the time Lucian wrote *VH* even he had written enough encounters in Hades!

[32] E.g. Bompaire 658.

[33] See *Theme and Variation* 25 f.

[34] II.2/Herod. IV.28; II.42/Megasthenes *FGH* II.413, fr. 17, and the line of Antimachus quoted by Lucian *ad loc.*

[35] *Navig.* 9, cf. *D. Deor.* 26.

tion, so that they eventually fell into two almost parallel sequences. Or he could have begun by writing only one of his two books [36] (not necessarily the first); and when it was enthusiastically received and an encore commissioned, he could then have produced a second, saving time and displaying his virtuosity by improvising quite different material along the same plan. The first book could scarcely have been recited exactly as it stands: Lucian could not leave himself in the middle of the whale, unless the sequel was to follow immediately.[37] If he wrote I complete, then constructed II later, he could have revised the book-division to add a touch of suspense for performance on a single occasion.

Was there a third book? Lucian leaves us at II.47 with an unfulfilled promise to recount his adventures in the opposite continent. Bompaire [38] sincerely believed that he intended to keep it, and that only unforeseen circumstances could have prevented him. But the scholia [39] represent this as Lucian's ultimate lie, and it need only be a parody of historical cross-reference. Since Lucian condemns one of the bogus historians in *Hist.* 31 for making a similar promise, this was his opportunity to turn his own advice into a practical joke at the expense of his reader. One cannot agree with Ollier [40] that 'L. avait trop de goût et trop de mesure pour ne pas sentir qu'il ne faut pas prolonger excessivement des plaisanteries de ce genre.' If he had, *VH* would have been considerably shorter. But he has now worked out his symmetrical scheme to the full; and he may have wished to suggest some new turn of events to correspond to the escape from the whale.

*VH* suggests what we should look for in the rest of Lucian: we are dealing with an ingenious but effortless writer, who will make a handful of motifs do duty at every possible opportunity and will not hesitate to use facile schemes to achieve his effects.

---

[36] It is an attractive but unproven hypothesis that *Bacchus* was a *prolalia* composed to introduce *VH* II to an audience which had heard Book I the previous year (A. Thimme, *Jahrb. f. Philol.* 34, 1888, 562).

[37] Cf. Helm, *PW* 1763 f.

[38] 673.

[39] p. 24 Rabe.

[40] Lucien, *Histoire Vraie*, Paris 1962, 2. A. Scobie (*Aspects of the Ancient Romance and its Heritage*, Meisenheim 1969, 89) suggests an allusion to 'the tedious, interminable meanderings of the heroes of the Greek romances.' But this particular promise is not a topos in the extant examples.

CHAPTER TWO

# *TOXARIS* AND *PHILOPSEUDES*

*Verae Historiae* is about marvellous adventures. Lucian knew how to make the most of his material, so that it is no surprise to see him dividing it elsewhere into two, and devoting one half to adventures, the other to marvels. *VH* was presented as a continuous narrative; in *Toxaris* and *Philopseudes* he uses mock-serious dialogue as a framework for two collections of separate tales.[1] But the techniques of literary *plasma* are the same throughout.

## A. TOXARIS

Among Lucian's narratives the *Toxaris* has been almost wholly neglected. It is too late to offer much information for the history of the Greek novella; and scholars have been deterred from looking too far afield for sources,[2] when Lucian himself claims that the tales of friendship are examples from recent history (10). This in itself does not make them authentic, and there have been two tentative lines of approach. Bompaire [3] characteristically assumes that handbooks supplied most of Lucian's needs, and collections περὶ φιλίας were certainly available;[4] while Rostovtseff [5] explained the convincing background to Lucian's Scythian tales from lost Greek novels set in Scythia. The latter view is all the more tempting when we know that the elusive Antonius Diogenes opened his novel in the Caspian area.[6]

Lucian would have had his usual incentive, however, to contribute something on his own account. Like *VH*, *Toxaris* is another

[1] On the novella as such, see O. Weinreich, *Fabel, Aretalogie, Novelle*, Heidelberg 1931; S. Trenkner, *The Greek Novella in the Classical Period*, Cambridge 1958 (with a much wider scope than the title suggests); for an invaluable bibliographical survey, Q. Cataudella, *La novella greca*, Naples 1957. For the anecdote, fable and short tale as part of a sophist's equipment, see Bompaire 443-468; I have discussed Lucian's free use of 'academic' *exempla* in *Theme and Variation* 41-48.

[2] For Schissel's attempt to connect them with *Milesiaca*, cf. *infra* c. VII.

[3] 455, 675.

[4] E.g. Val. Max. IV.7, cf. ps.-Plut. *Amatoriae Narrationes* (*Mor.* 771E ff.); also Trenkner, *o.c.* 71 f. and notes.

[5] *Skythien und der Bosporus* I, Berlin 1931, 196-99.

[6] Cf. Rohde, *Gr. Rom.*[3] 278.

opportunity for *pseudos*: the Scythian storyteller demands an oath from his Greek rival, on the grounds that this sort of thing is not difficult to make up (11). But his own oath (38) is so ludicrous that the reader must be prepared for plenty of fiction. And although he condemns Mnesippus' story-telling as the sort of thing that Greeks are always contriving for effect (42), he himself tells the tallest story of all, with two further lying tales woven into it (44-55)!

It is convenient to start with the Scythian tales, since Lucian's basic material here is easier to detect, and his method more apparent. The four shorter tales are *plasmata* of elementary motifs drawn directly from Herodotus, or from material which, if not Lucian's own, was certainly in his general repertoire. We can expect him to translate any fantastic material into Scythian terms. Herodotus mentions that the women of the Sauromatae must prove themselves in battle before they can marry (IV.117), while Plato encourages male friendships because they produce better fighting men (*R* 468B, cf. *Vit. Auct.* 17). Lucian will conflate and travesty both passages twice over: on the moon Endymion offers Lucian his son's hand in marriage after distinguished services in battle; in Scythia warriors woo their friends as the Greeks woo their brides (*VH* I.22; *Tox.* 37).

In the first Scythian tale (39 ff.) Amizokes makes a pact of friendship with Dandamis. This is put to the test in an enemy raid three days later, when he is captured and dragged off calling on his friend. Dandamis ransoms him at the cost of his own eyes, and Amizokes in turn blinds himself to match his friend. It is worthwhile to compare a motif preserved in slightly different guise in fable (580 Perry): two men have a pact with Juppiter that the one will receive double what is given to the other. One is blinded in one eye, the other in both. Substitute friends for enemies, and Lucian's version follows automatically. There is no lack of 'historical' material along the same lines. Athenaeus cites two almost contiguous hints of the situation here: the parasite Cleisophos mimics Philip of Macedon's loss of an eye by bandaging his own (248E); the Arabians mimic their king's disabilities (249A); and the Celtic Sotiani must die when their king dies. Lucian could have found any of his information in just such a context, and transferred it to Scythia; he could equally well be expected to improvise within the style of these θαυμασία. They fit well into a 'Scythian' context: the Scythians blind their enemies (Herod. IV.1 ff.); and the sacrifice of an eye is a standard

motif in rhetorical melodrama, parodied by Petronius' *hunc oculum pro vobis impendi* (*Sat.* 1.1). Clearly the notion of 'removable eyes' appealed to Lucian: the Scythians use their eyes as a ransom; on the moon the rich are able to hoard this valuable commodity in an eye-bank! [7]

In the second Scythian tale (43) a man dies while protecting his wounded friends from a lion, which also dies in the encounter. One tomb commemorates the lion, another opposite the two friends. Once more Herodotus and the rhetorical schools are here: Lucian may well be dressing up the hackneyed exemplum of Othryades' death (Herod. I.82) in a new 'barbarian' guise: he condemns it as a rhetorician's last resort in *Rh. Pr.* 18, but uses it himself at *Charon* 24. And once again there is a parallel in fable: Perry 284 deals with a monument to a man who strangled a lion; Lucian's contemporary Iamblichus has a monument to a lion as part of the exotic local decoration for a novel set in Babylon;[8] Aelian has anecdote material about the Libyans, who specially honour men killed by elephants; and Lucian himself is specially interested in exotic memorials in exotic places.[9]

In the fourth Scythian tale (57 ff.) Toxaris himself tells how he went to a strange city with a friend, and lost his money; the friend retrieved it by trying his luck as a gladiator. There are two typical motifs here: the despondent Scythian lost in a foreign city, just as Anacharsis himself is lost in Athens, *Scytha* 3; and the savage bewildered by his first sight of civilised sport, as in *Anach.* 1, *Charon* 8. M. Kokolakis [10] has shown that the gladiatorial proclamation and other features are not authentic, but suggests that Lucian may have drawn on his own local knowledge of Amastris, which he mentions in the course of his adventures with Alexander of Abonoteichos (*Alex.* 57). This supports the argument that he is piecing together whatever he can.

The last tale (61) is simply an enlarged allusion to Herodotus: Abauchas rescues his friend from a fire rather than his wife and child, who are easier to replace; and there are no fewer than four Herodotean episodes involved: Psammenitus of Egypt grieves more for his friend than his son (III.14 ff.); Intaphernes' wife chooses to

---

[7] *Tox.* 40/*VH* I.25.

[8] Phot. *Cod.* 94.74a.

[9] *Theme and Variation* 33 ff.; *infra* 74 f.

[10] ΠΛΑΤΩΝ 10 (1958), 334 f.

spare her brother rather than her husband (III.119);[11] Sesostris sacrifices a son in a fire (II.109); and in fires in Egypt only the tom-cats are saved (II.66 ff.). Since this is the last tale of all, Lucian may have felt that a very obvious tribute to the master was required.

The third Scythian tale (44-55) is by far the most complex and controversial. Here Bompaire makes concessions to Lucian's talent for pastiche,[12] and sees a Herodotean fantasy 'naissant directement de l'humour',[13] while Rostovtseff [14] again looks for his *Urquelle* in some 'Scythian' novel. Lucian must have used Herodotus here: otherwise he could scarcely have made the mistake of calling the Machlyes a *Scythian* tribe. They are mentioned as Libyans at IV. 178, 180, in a passage certainly known to him.[15] The material is a digression in the elaborate account of the Scythians: Lucian has fused it, accidentally or otherwise, with its context. At the same time the Gindanes, a Libyan tribe, reappear as the name of a Scythian hero! [16] Herodotus also mentions that the Scythians used stretched hides (IV.64), and as Bompaire noticed (683), they swear oaths by the king's hearth (IV.70). Lucian is always interested in ridiculous oaths:[17] as a matter of course his Scythians now swear by the oxhide itself! The military paraphernalia have come from the same place: at IV.119 f. news comes of Darius' advance and there is a council of war; Lucian's Leucanor similarly finds out that the Scythian Arsacomas is raising troops against him, and takes counsel accordingly (*Tox.* 50). There is a *coup d'état* for the Persian throne in III.72, and the king's assassin escapes with the severed head in his hand: here Lonchates deals with Leucanor in the same way.

Rostovtseff's case, however, is supported by two papyrus frag-

---

[11] The parallel cited by P. Modinos from Indian folklore is superfluous (*Bulletin de la Société Royale d'archéologie d'Alexandrie* 38 (1949), 51-54). Lucian knew his Herodotus thoroughly, and uses the material on either side of the story of Intaphernes as well (Polycrates, III.120/*Charon* 14; amber on the Eridanus, III.115/*Electr.*).

[12] For Scythians in rhetorical tradition, cf. Philostratus, *VS* 572, Bompaire, 227 ff.

[13] 676 cf. 682 ff.

[14] *Seminarium Kondakovianum, Études Byzantines* II, Prague 1928, 138.

[15] He draws on information about the Garamantes for his own *Libykos* (IV.174/*de Dipsadibus*).

[16] IV.176/*Tox.* 61.

[17] *Tox.* 38, *Vit. Auct.* 4. For other examples, see *Theme and Variation* 20, 120.

ments from a novel.[18] In the first a heroine (Calligone?) is evidently lamenting after bad news from the Sarmatians; and both fragments contain the name Eubiotos (her faithful henchman?), as Lucian's story does. It is difficult to reconcile the first fragment with Toxaris' version as it stands: the only occasion here when Mazaea can be lamenting is when she hears how her father king Leucanor has been murdered (sometime after *Tox.* 50). She could certainly not have any contact with Lucian's Eubiotos at this point; and word would come *from* Bosporus *to* the Sarmatians to reach him, since he is living with them at the time of the murder, as we find later (*Tox.* 54). Nor does Mazaea attempt to commit suicide, as the Calligone of the second fragment is evidently doing. But Lucian could still be adapting from such a source, and we are still left with the coincidence that Eubiotos should be connected at all with the Sarmatians: he could be a character from a well-known Scythian novel, but there is no way of proving that Lucian used him in his original capacity; he might be no more than a mere prop.[19] The latter is more consistent with Lucian's practice: the novelists and New Comic dramatists have their repertoire of interchangeable names, and so has he.[20] This Graeco-Scythian grandee is all the more suspect when he appears in the same context as the somewhat bogus Tigrapates (*Tox.* 44).

The framework of the tale is simple: apart from the motif of helping a friend in need—common to all the tales—there is an initial scene and three episodes. The king refuses the poor suitor (44-46) when choosing his daughter's husband at a banquet. Bompaire notes the cases cited by Athenaeus,[21] where a princess proposes, not the suitor as here. Lucian could be deliberately reversing a motif from a well-known scrap of tradition, or improvising on the most elementary material.[22]

Here Arsacomas puts up his friends as his 'bid' for the princess:

---

[18] Medea Norsa, *PSI* 981, vol. VIII (1927), 196-99 (= P. Cair. 47992). For a fuller account, see R. M. Rattenbury in *New Chapters in Greek Literature* III, ed. J. U. Powell, Oxford 1933, 240-44.

[19] As suggested by F. Zimmermann, *PhW* 55 (1935), 1215.

[20] Cf. Indopatres, *Katapl.* 21; and the displays of orientalia at *Icar.* 15, *D. Mort.* 27. Also Bompaire, 699-704; Schwartz, *Biographie* 106.

[21] 455 and n. 5, Athen. 575 f.: versions from Chares of Mytilene's περὶ Ἀλεξάνδρου X (from a Perso-Scythian source); and Arist. *Const. Mass.* fgt. 549 Rose.

[22] The young bride's escape from repugnant marriage to a rich suitor is a standard folklore theme: see Trenkner, *Greek Novella, o.c.* 82 and n. 2.

οἱ φίλοι θησαυροί is a commonplace of the schools,[23] and the rest is in a common anecdote tradition: a Spartan mother contrasts her own possessions—four sons—with an Ionian woman's weaving (Plut. *Mor.* 241D); a Spartan bride brings her chastity as a dowry (242B); or Sinaetes offers Artaxerxes a handful of water as his humble but honest gift (*Mor.* 172B, Aelian *VH* I.32).

But Lucian may not have had to look very far outside Herodotus IV for either motif. He knew the story of Hippocleides in Herod. VI.29 and quotes it twice as a proverb: the point of the story is that Hippocleides disqualifies himself from winning the hand of Cleisthenes' daughter by his ridiculous behaviour at a banquet. Lucian is well able to manipulate this sort of material. Three of the guests in his *Symposium* disgrace themselves at a marriage-feast: Alcidamas makes indecent boasts about his prowess (*Conv.* 18); Ion proposes a shameful marriage-arrangement (39); and Histiaeus makes a naive offering in honour of the bride (40 f.); in effect Arsacomas combines all three outrages at once. As for the faithful friends, Aristagoras of Miletus at Herod. V.29-32 also admits to having no resources of his own, but claims to be a friend of Artaphernes who will be able to provide an army on his behalf. A transfer from Asia Minor to Scythia would be no trouble to Lucian.

Arsacomas and his two friends now perform one feat each, all three incredible. This is also, in effect, the outline of Lucian's *Navigium*, in which three friends meet and act out their incredible wishes. It is no surprise that the three absurd exploits here coincide with the most ridiculous details of Timolaus' last wish (*Navig.* 44): Lonchates murders an arrogant king (*Tox.* 49 f.), while Timolaus proposes to cast down tyrants; Macentes gains access to a virgin bride, (*Tox.* 51 f.), while Timolaus expects to reach his favourites by putting their guardians to sleep; and Arsacomas swings the course of battle single-handed (*Tox.* 55). Timolaus is able to do the same.

Within this framework, which would call for little effort on Lucian's part, he has room for a number of familiar details: Toxaris criticises the Greek way of pouring libations; as usual wealth is measured in golden cups, before he adds the 'characteristic' detail of Scythian wagons;[24] there is an opportunity for more territorial disputes; and the Bosporus is overdue with its tribute, like Scin-

---

[23] Theon, Spengel II. p. 100 (in the mouth of Alexander the Great).

[24] Libations 45, cf. *Sacr.* 13; cups and wagons 46, cf. *Scytha* 1. For Lucian's 'Scythian' decorations, see Bompaire 683 ff.

tharus in the whale.[25] Lonchates escapes by an unusual ruse after beheading Leucanor (50): he leaves the temple still pretending to talk to the king inside, when in fact he is carrying the king's severed head under his cloak. Lucian may have known a version of the grotesque tale quoted by Aelian (*VH* XI.8), in which Cleomenes pretends to hold 'consultations' with the (embalmed) head of his friend Archonides; and Chiomara conceals her ravager's head in her garment to deliver it to her husband (Plut. *Mor.* 258 f.). Lucian himself often uses the motif of concealing something dreadful under a cloak: the philosopher hides all his shameful doings in this way as he tries to smuggle them past Hermes into Hades;[26] and Alexander of Abonoteichos performs a ventriloquist's trick while hiding a snake's head under his arm and exhibiting a false human head. As for the beheading itself, there is an equally grotesque version in *D. Meretr.* 3.3. Again, Macentes' ploy to lure Mazaea away from Adyrmachus is an excuse for another lying tale,[27] where Lucian can indulge his taste for court intrigue;[28] and the distinction he quotes between Scyths and Alans (length of hair, 52) is the same as the difference between moon- and comet-men in *VH* I.23. Finally, Lonchates eloquently varies the paradox that Arsacomas is really one person in three places—thanks to his two friends (53); Lucian uses the same conceit for his attack on Heracles in *D. Mort.* 16.5.

There is a marked lack of clarity in the minor details, and Harmon [29] thought that this was due to faulty abridgement. Eubiotos' role is not clear (51): but Lucian has only to create the vaguest semblance of Scythian politics, and he can multiply plausible names *ad infinitum*.[30] Again, he introduces an extra horseman to supervise the safe conduct of Mazaea, then loses sight of him (52 ff.): but he can introduce companion figures for a single moment in any context, be it his own servant Xenophon, a painter's assistant Micio, or the type-name Tibeius.[31] He also loses sight of twenty thousand Sarmatians and the fate of Macentes (55): but the story is far too complicated for the listener to grasp at a hearing, and inconsistencies do

---

[25] Territorial disputes 49, cf. *Icar.* 18, *Navig.* 38, *Katapl.* 21; tribute 44, cf. *VH* I.36.

[26] *D. Mort.* 10.8; cf. *Conv.* 46, *Herm.* 81; *Merc. Cond.* 34; *Adv. Ind.* 12.

[27] *Tox.* 51, cf. *VH* I.3; II. 36.

[28] Cf. *Icar.* 15, *Gall.* 25, *Katapl.* 8 ff.

[29] *LCL* V.184-189, 194 f.

[30] Cf. Bompaire, 699-704; *Theme and Variation* 51.

[31] *Alex.* 56; *Zeuxis* 7; *Philops.* 30, *D. Meretr.* 9.

not necessarily point to epitome—the love-romances are scarcely models of clarity even when intact! [32] Lucian's confusions here arise naturally out of his 'Herodotean' sequence of events.[33]

Whether he had a romance before him or not, it is clear that any feature of his story not adapted from Herodotus could have come directly from his own repertoire. Moreover Lucian's narrative is made to serve an ironic purpose: the Scythian has accused Mnesippus of Greek glibness, even though he used purple passages very sparingly; the Scythian boasts that he will do the same (35, 42), only to launch instead into a ludicrously overloaded narrative. Lucian's task, then, is to distend the simplest outline with as much grotesque and irrelevant detail as possible.

The Greek tales are less eventful, but the pattern is the same. I have analysed the tale of Deinias and Charicleia elsewhere (12-18). Lucian has contaminated themes of adultery, murder, and faithful friendship—each quite separable—into a rambling narrative, with much development of the details for their own sake. By contrast the second tale contains little material of any kind. Euthydicus simply rescues his sick friend Damon when the latter falls overboard (19-21). Like the voyage of the *Isis* in *Navig.* 7-9 this is no more than a 'captain's' tale', and calls for a similar storm-scene. It would have been convincing enough for Lucian's purpose if the two friends had been rescued when the crew threw down the gangplank (20). But they are first kept afloat on pieces of cork: this superfluous detail is once more reminiscent of the author's interest in floating corks and walking on the water.[34]

The next two tales are told only in brief outline. The pauper Eudamidas leaves instructions in his will for his two rich friends Aretaeus and Charixenus to dowry his daughter (22); and Zenothemis obliges his disgraced friend Menecrates by marrying the latter's ugly daughter himself, then risking political disfavour to have his father-in-law reinstated (24-26). Lucian needs tales based on civic institutions to contrast with the amazing goings-on in Scythia. But again the background does not necessarily indicate the true ingre-

---

[32] E.g. Achilles Tatius V.23/V.26 (Gaselee *LCL* 289); VII.9/11 (*ibid.* 369); for Charito, see Perry, *Ancient Romances* 130, 138.

[33] Theon (Spengel II.86) advises the pupil to practise retelling stories after the manner of Herodotus, rather than straight from beginning to end. Lucian had only to look at the delays in the story of Croesus (I.26 ff.; 69 ff.; III.36); or Polycrates (III. 39 ff., 120 ff.); he knew both of them well enough.

[34] *VH* II.4 (men with corks attached!); *Philops.* 13.

dients of the tale. For both of these it is tempting to compare the story of Philip of Macedon and the actor Satyrus cited in the *de Falsa Legatione* of both Aeschines and Demosthenes.[35]

Philip is celebrating a victory and offers Satyrus anything he wants: the latter asks to be allowed to pay the dowry for the daughters of his dead friend, who had killed Philip's brother. There are three motifs here. Satyrus horrifies his powerful friend at a festival; he takes up the obligation to look after a deceased friend's daughters; and he risks his life to further the interests of a friend who has been disgraced. To produce Mnesippus' third and fourth tales, Lucian has only to regroup these motifs very slightly and change the background. 'The man who dowries his friend's daughters' now becomes a tale in itself (this time with two men and only one daughter); and the remaining two motifs are combined in a different way: Zenothemis horrifies Menecrates at a feast by proposing to marry his ugly daughter; he later risks his own future to plead for his disgraced father-in-law. The background has moved from Philip's court to an oligarchy in Massilia. Since Mnesippus is telling the Scythian about the virtues of Greek friends there is no place for Macedonian courtiers: but there can scarcely be any doubt that Lucian knew the tale; although he has no genuine interest in Demosthenes, he could not escape knowing one of the two most celebrated speeches. For a writer of Lucian's inclination, moreover, such a passage would be one of the memorable highlights; he would otherwise have no interest in the content of the speeches as such—except as models for invective. Trenkner assumed that Lucian and Demosthenes were using variations on a common original.[36] Given Lucian's working methods and the prestige of the two speeches, I have no doubt that he set out to 'remake' two little *plasmata* of his own direct from a famous original. But there is also room for several of his own usual *leitmotifs*. In the story of Eudamidas he is developing yet another variation on the paradoxical legacy. In the series at *D. Mort* 5-9 the old inherit from the young; here he has contrived a situation where the dead inherit from the living (22)! And instead of the usual *captatores*, Eudamidas has two faithful friends to execute his demanding will. In the story of Menecrates and Zenothemis, not only do we find another outrageous proposal at a feast; Zenothemis also takes his friend's ugly daughter and makes a woman of her

[35] Dem. *de Falsa Legatione* 192 ff.; *Aeschines id.* 156.
[36] *O.c.* 162.

almost on the spot: in Lucian's symposium Alcidamas tries to do the same for the flute-girl (46). And again there is room for Herodotus: Lucian adds that Menecrates' infant grandson won the sympathy of the assembly. Now he knew Herod. V.92, since he parodies the story of Periander's wife in *Philops.* 27: he must also have known one of its immediate predecessors, in which the infant Cypselus smiles at his ten assassins and so escapes.

In Mnesippus' last tale (27-34) Demetrius incriminates himself in order to share his friend Antiphilus' captivity in Egypt (32). Such motifs are extremely flexible: Aelian cites a case (*VH* II.4) where Melanippus confesses to Phalaris when his friend Charito is wrongly imprisoned; and Philostratus (*VA* V.25) includes an episode where a man has been falsely accused in Egypt. Lucian has only to change the crime and the scenery while retaining the theme of 'shared captivity' from his first story (18).[37] Antiphilus is caught with a cup stolen from a temple,[38] and Demetrius has sailed up the Nile to hear the oracle of Memnon (27), as Eucrates does in the prelude to his story of the sorcerer's apprentice (*Philops.* 33). For corroborative detail, Demetrius becomes apprenticed to the Brahmans, as Eucrates or Peregrinus were to the Egyptians (*Philops.* 33 f.; *Peregr.* 17).

As we have seen in *VH*, the arrangement of material may itself offer some hint about how Lucian uses his sources. This is equally important here. The Greek Mnesippus and his Scythian rival had agreed to tell a series of five tales each (11). But how are the groups arranged? Amid laborious and oversubtle discussion of the relative length of tales, Schissel [39] contends that they are not intended to correspond tale by tale, but that Lucian has given both speakers a free hand to elaborate suitable topoi about friendship as the opportunity arises. Bompaire too found no arrangement within the tales (465), but his evidence rests on the fact that Mnesippus tells us so: the stories are to be the first that spring to mind (35). But Lucian is scarcely to be trusted, when both speakers in *Tox.* make extraordinary promises which they cannot keep: Mnesippus swears that he will tell his stories without any theatricals on his part (12), but dramatises to a considerable degree in 20 and 34; Toxaris himself promises to avoid embellishment, since that is not the Scythian way (35)—yet his preamble still lasts till 38! And Mnesippus dis-

[37] For the details, see *Theme and Variation* 49 f.
[38] Cf. *Herm.* 37 ff.; *Icar.* 16.
[39] *Rhetorische Forschungen* II, Halle 1912, 68.

believes Toxaris and his fantastic oath to tell the truth (36) after his incredible third tale. In *Nigrinus* also, Lycinus promises that he can only give a random account of his meeting with the master (8), but this is only a concession to Pl. *Phaedr.* 228D which he does not strictly observe.[40] We need not expect Lucian to be any more trustworthy here.

To make an effective *syncrisis* between Greek and barbarian he has to make the tales as different as possible. But this does not mean that they should not have the same points of departure: in both groups he develops the same basic formulae in the same order, first under Greek then under Scythian conditions:

| | *Greek*: | *Scythian*: |
|---|---|---|
| I: | | |
| A man pays a ransom for his friend, and both share the same lot. | Agathocles sells his farms (12 ff.); both are held on Gyarus. | Dandamis hands over his eyes (39 ff.); both are blinded. |
| II: | | |
| A man is prepared to sacrifice his own life in the face of natural hazards. | Euthydicus braves a storm (19 ff.). | Belitta faces a lion (43). |
| III: | | |
| A man shows a blind faith in two friends to honour a dowry-arrangement he has made without consulting them. | Eudamidas (22 f.). | Arsacomas (44 ff.). |
| IV: | | |
| A man makes a public sacrifice to restore his friend's fortune after loss. | Zenothemis marries his friend's daughter and pleads in the senate (24 ff.). | Sisinnes fights in the arena (57 ff.). |
| V: | | |
| A man finds and rescues a sick friend who is trapped. | Demetrius traces Antiphilus and rescues him from prison (27 ff.). | Abauchas finds Gyndanes and rescues him from being cut off by fire (61). |

Lucian has decorated these formulae with the 'correct' rhetorical trappings proper to Greeks and Scythians: the Greek tales involve

[40] For the formal aspects of Nigrinus' speech, see Bompaire 277.

domestic intrigue and a murder charge, sailing, honouring a will, pleading in court, and being wrongfully accused of theft: the fantastic situations are still both civilised and 'tame'. Faced with the same dilemmas in the same order, the Scythians all have grotesque adventures: taking out eyes, fighting wild beasts, raising armies, facing gladiators, and sacrificing an only child. The contrast between the third tales of each group is especially marked: the two Greek friends execute the preposterous will inside a few lines; the corresponding Scythian story takes up eleven paragraphs, in which the two friends have to murder a king and fetch a virgin bride to oblige their Scythian blood-brother in the same way. When Lucian has so obviously developed the contrasting tales for their own sakes, he could scarcely have expected his audience to notice the pairs; he has merely used the device as a rough guideline when composing or arranging his material. Another such guideline can be seen if we examine the parallel details within each group: in the Greek tales the first and last (12 ff., 27 ff.) are long stories dealing with friends who choose to share a prison sentence; in the Scythian tales the second and fourth (43, 57 ff.) deal with single combat on a friend's behalf. Such symmetrical arrangements are also found in *Philopseudes* (I, V on magicians; II, IV on statues/*revenants*), where they serve a genuine purpose: the conversation is made to turn full circle. There is no such point here, and any other arrangement would have served: it is tempting to suppose that Lucian was content to repeat an arbitrary procedure which had served him well in the past.

I have already suggested that Lucian had the resources to invent his own tales.[41] The use he makes of parallel arrangement here suggests that he had a further incentive. It is again difficult to believe that any material available to him from handbooks fell so neatly into these schemes; and it is still more likely that he was forced to invent, adjust or contaminate at least some of the stories to fit a gap in his scheme.

## B. PHILOPSEUDES

In *Philopseudes* we have exactly the same problems against a different background: if Lucian had the means and motive to make up ten anecdotes about Greek and Scythian friendship, could he do the same for tales about popular superstition? Again Bompaire believes that any long series of material in Lucian must come from

[41] *Theme and Variation* 48-62, *supra* 12 ff.

handbooks: when he writes in bulk, then he must also be borrowing in bulk, in this case from a περὶ θαυμασίων.[42] Of course the stories are founded ultimately in authentic magical practice, as Radermacher's parallels from folklore have shown,[43] and subsequent commentators have tended to assume that he must have resorted to a collection.[44] Caster suggested that the tales are completely transformed,[45] but only because of the author's hostile approach. Once more Lucian's literary contribution has still to be taken into account.

*Philopseudes* is concerned even more obviously than *Toxaris* with *pseudos*, and Lucian improvises tall stories for their own sake elsewhere: at *Peregr.* 39 he admits that he made up a bogus apotheosis for anyone willing to be deceived.[46] And his purpose throughout *Verae Historiae* was to tell all sorts of lies in a convincing manner (3). Moreover the sophisticated raconteur in antiquity was not always obliged to use collections. An assured parodist such as Petronius might be expected to produce a 'version' of 'folktale' as easily as he could produce pseudo-Lucan or pseudo-Seneca;[47] and Bompaire himself admits that magic was well established as a literary theme.[48] Not only is it a standard ornament for the erotic novel;[49] it also found its way into sophistic displays.[50] It is no surprise that Lucian's 'magic' themes usually lie well within his narrow repertoire of literary texts: the Asslegs might be a temptation for an unwary folklorist (*VH* II.46), but Lucian has obviously conflated Empousa with the Sirens and Circe;[51] and Timolaus' magic rings are legitimate material, because Plato had already used one in the myth of Gyges.[52] The same literary inhibitions are at work in *Philops.*: Cleodemus' adventure in Hades is a burlesque of Lucian's favourite Platonic

---

[42] 457.

[43] Festschrift Th. Gomperz, Vienna 1902, 197-207; *RhM* N.F. 60 (1905), 315-317; *ARW* 21 (1922), 233-35; *Sitzungsberichte der Akademie der Wissenschaft in Wien*, Abh. 4, Vienna 1927, 5-15.

[44] E.g. L. Müller, *In Luciani Philopseuden Commentarius, Eos Suppl.* 13 (1932), *passim*; O. Herzig, *Lukian als Quelle für die antike Zauberei*, Diss. Tübingen 1933, 1940, 32; also R. Reitzenstein, *Hellenistische Wundererzählungen*, 39 n.

[45] *Pensée* 312 f.

[46] For the contents of this *plasma*, see *Theme and Variation* 52 ff.

[47] *Sat.* 62 (but see *infra* 108 ff.).

[48] 363 ff.

[49] *Infra* 84 f.

[50] Philostratus *VS* 590 (Adrian); 619 (Hippodromus).

[51] Ar. *Ran.* 293/cf. *Katapl.* 22; *Od.* X. 321 ff., XII. 45 f.

[52] *Navig.* 42 ff./*R.* 359D ff.

myth (*R* 614B ff.); the story of Eucrates' wife is a travesty of Periander's rites for Melissa (Herod. V.92); there is a precedent for Pancrates' δαίμων πάρεδρος in Hephaestus' golden maidservants (*Il.* XVIII.417); Lucian knew the theme of the 'lover summoned' (14) from Hellenistic Idyll, as is clear from the doublet at *D. Meretr.* 4; and he may well have known the story of the haunted house as a theme from New Comedy preserved in Plautus' *Mostellaria.* He has used the same degree of literary pastiche in the surrounding dialogue.[53]

I have examined the tale of Glaucias and Chrysis elsewhere:[54] Lucian used the routine motif of enticing a lover by magic as an excuse for introducing irrelevant hocus-pocus and humorous twists (14 f.). Another typical example of his technique can be seen in the story of the missing snake (12): a magician charms away all the snakes but the eldest, sends the youngest snake to fetch it, then burns them all together. Numerous parallels have been offered from European folklore, but none from antiquity; and this leaves the risk that the folktale developed from second-hand versions of the classical author. Here the traditional German, Austrian, and Polish tales assembled by Radermacher and Müller [55] differ in two respects from Lucian's version: the magician is killed by the last snake to arrive; and of course it did not have to be sent for—it is the 'big brother' coming for revenge! Reitzenstein and others [56] therefore argued in favour of a common source, which Lucian had modified with a happy ending, so as to introduce his joke about the snake arriving with a walking stick (13, cf. the limping lion, 8). This is plausible enough, but it still leaves a large sequence which does not occur in the folk versions: after the magician counts the snakes and finds one missing, a messenger has to be sent to summon it to the same fate as the others. Bompaire [57] is reluctant to give Lucian credit for all such details, but where else does this situation occur? In *Katapl.* 4 Aeacus notices that one of the souls is missing from among the new (and equally assorted) arrivals in Hades. He sends Hermes to fetch it, and only after he returns with the captive can

---

[53] The prison-scene in Pl. *Phaedo* 60B ff. (with a very different sort of περὶ ψυχῆς); the discussion on cures, *Charmides* 155B ff./*Philops.* 7 ff.; and the sequence of speeches, as in the *Symposium.*

[54] For the details, see *Theme and Variation* 51 f.

[55] *RhM* N. F. 60 (1905), 316; *Eos, o.c.* 43-45.

[56] *Hellenistische Wundererzählungen* 3-4; Müller, *ibid.*; Herzig, 24 f.

[57] 624n. 41.

the rest be ferried across the Styx. All that Lucian needs here is the basic subject of snakecharming, his general interest in 'imagination zoologique',[58] and another of his standard themes, the 'runaway pursued'.[59]

There are other instances where what appears to be a 'magic' theme reappears in some quite different context. The Hyperborean walks on the water (13), like the corkfeet in *VH* II.4; and with brogues on his feet, like the foolish Paphlagonian priests in *Alex.* The Syrian asks a smokey spirit for its name and origin (16): again the practice is well enough authenticated, and one of the basic tasks of the θεῖος ἀνήρ, like Apollonius of Tyana's exorcisms;[60] Lucian need not have been more than vaguely aware of the Egyptian documents cited by Müller,[61] and again the practice overlaps conveniently with two of his own most characteristic interests: Empedocles identifies himself to Menippus in the guise of a burnt cinder (*Icar.* 13); and the smoke of a sacrifice gives the sender's name to Zeus (*ibid.* 26). As usual, too, Lucian is careful to specify the language which the freak is supposed to use (cf. *VH* I.8, II.46). For the case of the walking statues (18 ff.), Caster supplied enough ancient parallels to make Radermacher's medieval ones superfluous.[62] But Lucian himself has a special contempt for statues of all kinds: the prospect of one for Peregrinus offends him (*Peregr.* 41), and he makes fun of statues which fail to defend themselves against sacrilege (*J. Trag.* 25; cf. 33). His caricature of Pellichus' statue here (18) resembles his Silenus in *Bacch.* 2: both are generals, and in both cases the most improbable of commanders takes his enemy by surprise. Lucian has placed Pellichus among an impressive list of 'Old Masters' to show up Eucrates' bad taste; he laughs at the rich patron's aspirations in the same way at *Merc. Cond.* 35.[63]

In the description of Hades (24-5) the details belong to Lucian's standard picture:[64] Eucrates looks in through the same means as Menippus (cf. *Neky.* 9-10); the spectator from above can recognise his own relations (cf. *VH* I.26); and Plato is absent (cf. *VH* II.17). Apart from this, Cleodemus is allowed to come back from the dead

[58] 692 f.
[59] *Fugitivi*; *VH* II.26; *Vit. Auct.* 27.
[60] Philostr. *VA* III.38, IV.10, 20.
[61] *O.c.* 71.
[62] *Pensée* 329 ff.
[63] Cf. Aelian *VH* II.2.
[64] See Bompaire 365-378.

because Hermes had taken the wrong man (25). Aeacus was indignant at his premature arrival: in *Neky.* 10 and *Icar.* 22 Menippus causes consternation by arriving uninvited in both Hades and heaven; and Lucian himself has to be tried for reaching the Isles of the Blest before his time (*VH* II.10).

The present episode has been explained as *Volkshumor*,[65] as an allusion to Heraclides Ponticus [66] or Plutarch's περὶ ψυχῆς,[67] or as another borrowing from a collection.[68] But Lucian sets out elsewhere to exhaust all the possibilities of the theme of ἄνοδος from Hades;[69] this may be just another variation. Moreover Hermes goes to the wrong door in the same street: Lucian uses a similar case of confusion between two neighbours in *D. Meretr.* 2.4, where the subject is not funerals but weddings; and the gods are always having their little administrative problems: Hermes submits one corpse short of the 'official' list of dead, *Katapl.* 4; there will be a serious backlog of corpses, *Charon* 2, or lawsuits, *Bis Acc.* 3, or a delay in dealing with just requests, *Timon* 9. Given the basic motif of the Myth of Er (*R.* 614B ff.), these details are all Lucian needs.[70]

The next two stories offer Lucian little scope for variation. In 27 he has merely adapted the story of Melissa (Herod. V.92) to a more trivial setting: where Periander has to burn the clothes of every woman in Corinth, Eucrates has only to burn his wife's slipper! Her ghost is driven away not at dawn or cockcrow, but by the yelping of a pet Maltese. This indignity is probably Lucian's contribution:

---

[65] Reitzenstein, *Hell. Wund.* 6.

[66] Rohde, *Psyche* II.94; Radermacher, *Sitzungsberichte, o.c.* 13. Lucian's debt to Heraclides is still an open question: the *Abaris* enjoyed the popularity of a school text (Plut. *Mor.* 14E), and as such would offer Lucian something that his audience could recognise. But the case put by M. I. Lévy, *La légende de Pythagore de Grèce en Palestine*, Paris 1927, 79-93, is indecisive. The two fragments he compares to *VH* II.31 will fit other quite dissimilar passages in Lucian (fgt. 1/*Philops.* 14; fgt. 2/*VH* I.8), so that Bompaire's reservations (371 ff.) are more than justified.

[67] Sinko, *Symbolae Chronologicae ad scripta Plutarchi et Luciani*, Cracow 1947, 39.

[68] Müller, *o.c.* 87.

[69] Bompaire 375 f.

[70] J. Hubaux, *AC* 8 (1939), 96-109, collects several parallels from Classical literature where the 'wrong man' has a similar *name* to the victim who should have died. Lucian does not seem however to be making use of this motif here: there is a vague similarity between Cleodemus and Demylus, but Lucian does not place the names closely enough together to emphasise it; and he could have used much more similar names like Demylus-Damylus (*D. Meretr.* 10.2) or Demylus-Drimylus (*Gall.* 14).

he uses a Maltese again at *Merc. Cond.* 34—once more to bring a silly philosopher down to earth.[71] Arignotus now tells the story of how he exorcised the haunted house (30 f.). Detailed comparison with Pliny's wholly serious version (*Ep.* VII.27.4 f.) shows how little Lucian has been able to add; but such a theme is *de rigueur* in any account of *deisidaimonia*: we should not necessarily assume that Lucian held as closely to an 'original' in each of the other tales. He has added the ghost's irrelevant display of changing its shape,[72] as he added the moon's metamorphoses in 14; and Arignotus turns out to be a *magus gloriosus* when describing his 'battle' with the ghost: Pythagoras himself takes the same liberties in recounting his fight with Patroclus in *Gall.* 17.

Thanks to Goethe's version, the 'Sorcerer's Apprentice' (33-36) tends to be taken for granted as a self-contained, genuine folktale.[73] Because of the lack of parallels, Bompaire did suggest that Lucian could have made it up,[74] but he does not pursue the possibility, more especially since the papyri have revealed an authentic recipe for a δαίμων πάρεδρος.[75]

The Egyptian setting allows Lucian to insert some conventional decoration: Eucrates is apprenticed to a quack, like Alexander of Abonoteichos (*Alex.* 5); his master Pancrates [76] shares some features in common with the Egyptian slave-boy at *Navig.* 2. In one detail however there is room for a characteristic embellishment on Lucian's part: Pancrates not only rides the crocodiles (in accordance with the papyri),[77] but treats them as rather improbable pets: Lucian's Eros treats Rhea's lions in the same way (*D. Deor.* 12.2). And the magic process itself can be explained in terms of Lucian as well. It has been noticed [78] that the brooms and pestles enchanted by Pan-

---

[71] Cf. also *Conv.* 19. The present passage points to a borrowing from Theophrastus *Char.* XXI.9, which he then contaminated with *Char.* V. 5 to obtain *Merc. Cond.* 34.

[72] Radermacher *Sitzungsberichte o.c.* 13 n. 1.

[73] E.g. Herzig *o.c.* 28.

[74] 695 cf. 459.

[75] Reizenstein *Hell. Wund.* 5.

[76] The name Παγκράτης/Παχράτης does occur in the papyri: for discussion see Bompaire 458n. 2. But there is no need to assume, with J. Schwartz (Commentary[2], Paris 1963 *ad loc.*), that it points to a historical character here: Lucian could have made up no more suitable name for a pretentious magician.

[77] Schwartz, *o.c.* 56.

[78] By H. H. Davies, *The Classical Bulletin* 34.1 (1957), 1-2.

crates are not automata in the strict sense: they do not perform their proper function of sweeping or stirring. Instead the 'magic' reads like a facile combination of elements from the other tales: the pestle is animated like the clay Cupid in 14,[79] and runs amok in the laboratory like the bronze statuette in 21. Lucian has only to twist the basic motif in the tale of Chrysis and Glaucias (15): he had described in ludicrous detail what happens when the spell is put into reverse, and the various magic 'props' are tidied back into place. Here however (36) the point is that Eucrates only knows the first half of the spell and the magic remains in operation.

Elsewhere a number of the subsidiary motifs reappear in totally different contexts. Eucrates plays a naughty prank behind the master's back, like Hermes in Hephaestus' forge (*D. Deor.* 7.2). His ambition as the apprentice is to bring something superhuman to life out of an inanimate object—by turning the pestle into a δαίμων πάρεδρος; Lucian applies this same motif to himself at *Somn.* 3: it was his youthful ambition as a sculptor's apprentice to make little gods from his block of stone. In both stories the experiment ends in disaster: the apprentice loses control and splits his material in two—Eucrates the pestle, Lucian his stone; and both end their apprenticeship on the spot. Again the cunning Pancrates had left his pestle to work on its own; Lucian applies this motif as a rhetorical conceit at *Tyrannicida* 2: the tyrant-slayer uses the absurd argument that he left his sword to slay the tyrant on its own! The pestle also goes its own way, refusing to obey instructions in spite of its human clothes. This is very close to the situation at *Pisc.* 36: the monkeys forget their human costume and cause chaos by following their own instinct. The pestle causes havoc in the house when it moves off on its own; at *Sat.* 23 other domestic implements run off in the same way. The water-container replenishes itself, like the automatic cups in *VH* II.14. And the pestle is engaged in fruitless work: Lucian uses this motif as a 'philosophic' example at *Herm.* 79, and refers several times to the story of the daughters of Danaus (*Dips.* 6, *D. Mar.* 6, *Timon* 18). And at *Anach.* 35 he uses two of the essential motifs here in quick succession: strength is compared to an inexhaustible supply of liquid, and multiplies when divided, like the hydra's heads. Here the pestle does both—keeps carrying water, and splits into two water-carriers instead of one! Elsewhere Lucian

---

[79] As Schwartz noticed, *ad* 35.

can develop a tale out of no more than a proverb.[80] It is perhaps significant that the sculptor's apprentice in *Somnium* 3, and the philosopher's apprentice in *Herm.* 3 both quote the Hesiodic tag ἀρχὴ (δέ τοι) ἥμισυ παντός (*Erga* 40): Eucrates' beginning in magic has only taken him halfway, as he is forced to admit (ἐξ ἡμισείας γε 36).

There is not the slightest element in this story, then, that Lucian could not have supplied for himself, given the basic belief about δαίμονες. This climax to the discussion may well be his own synthesis; if not, it is still easy to see why it appealed to him.

Bompaire noticed that the tales have a wide provenance;[81] and he inferred that Lucian must have used a handbook which was itself arranged by countries. But he admits elsewhere that Lucian's statements about geography are often interchangeable (455), especially when he is discussing barbarians (229); in this case he could have produced the same result by consulting *any* handlist of magicians and assigning them to countries at random afterwards. He uses a wide spread of 'exotic' countries in the *prolaliae* (India, *Bacch.*; North Italy, *Electr.*; Scythia, *Scytha*; Libya, *Dips.*). In *Philopseudes* a love-match is arranged by a Hyperborean wizard, in *D. Meretr.* by a Syrian witch; and it is no surprise that the vinewomen in *VH* I.8 speak Indian, Lydian, or Greek! One of the orator's tricks singled out in *Rh. Pr.* is how to 'drop' exotic names: and Lucian has an unlikely precedent in his favourite Platonic dialogue—at *Phaedr.* 275B Socrates is accused of being able to attach a tale to the Egyptians—or anyone else—at will. In this case Lucian's 'answer' to Socrates, the pretender Eucrates, has the same licence!

Once more the question of arrangement is important. Scholars have seen in *Philopseudes* either a deliberate and artificial scheme, or completely haphazard storytelling. O. Schissel[82] found seven tales arranged under five successive headings on a hidden concentric principle; Helm divided the material into nine topics;[83] while Müller[84] dismissed Schissel's scheme without discussion and listed twelve tales in random order. This approach has been generally accepted, for various reasons: Caster[85] hailed it as the 'natural'

---

[80] *Theme and Variation* 41 n. 5, cf. 45.
[81] 457.
[82] *O.c.* 42.
[83] *PW* 1755.
[84] *Eos* Suppl. 13, Paris 1932, 23 f.
[85] *Pensée* 329.

order, representing the casual drift of conversation; Bompaire[86] found 'nul progression psychologique ou logique', and prefers to believe that Lucian has arranged the tales only to secure variety.

Part of the problem lies in careless or arbitrary description: Müller does not even attempt to distinguish between the basic motif of a story and the mass of corroborative detail which Lucian is liable to insert. He challenges Schissel for labelling 11-14 *de mago*, on the grounds that a magician also appears in 22-24; he might also have added the Syrian who exorcises a spirit in 16. But in these passages the magician is used in three different ways: Lucian gives a short, routine task to the magicians from Babylon and the Hyperboreans (11, 13), followed in each case by the elaborate incident where they play a leading role. In 16 he introduces the Syrian magician in the same way, but his feat is merely mentioned, in passing, and there is no elaborate story. And in 22-24 the magician has no preamble at all and does not even take a personal part in the story: Eucrates merely happens to use an Arab magician's ring as a charm against Hecate. Müller also exaggerated the importance of the ring: Eucrates mentions it in 17 and 24, but it is not a central feature in either place, far less a link between them. He also forces an incorrect parallel between 18 ff. and 33 ff.: the walking statues are *daemones* and come to life of their own accord, whereas the broom and pestle are mere magic implements, which have first to be dressed up and animated by a spell (35).

Any new analysis has to take account of the length and content of each unit, and of how it is related to its neighbours. In fact the material falls easily into two: long stories where Lucian has introduced a mass of details and cross-references; and brief allusions. For the adventures in Hades he uses both. Helm was content to describe Eucrates' account (22-24) as 'Erscheinung der Hecate'. But Lucian does not dwell on this aspect of the encounter: it is no more than a prelude to the long catalogue of what he was able to see in Hades (24). Cleodemus then gives an equally elaborate account of his visit, with the new element that he came back to tell the tale (25). Antigonus then mentions yet a third person who stayed alive after coming back, (26); but this time there is no description, and we are not told whether he was dead or alive; in the long story

---

[86] 465. Radermacher, *Sitzungsberichte, o.c.* 12, divided the material into two strata, one of them allegedly extracted from Heraclides Ponticus; but this is hopelessly arbitrary.

which follows Demainete too comes back from the dead, with yet another new element, that she returns to claim her property (27). Schissel groups Antigonus' brief contribution with the visions of Hades: but in fact there is no vision described here, and it serves instead as a short transitional link between the two big descriptions of Hades and the next quite distinctive motif, *revenants*.

If one breaks down all the material in this way, the conversation does follow a regular pattern:

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| 7: Opening frame: Tychiades comes in as the philosophers are discussing quack remedies. | | |
| 11: Transition from quack remedies to the magicians who perform them. | | |
| 12: A magician sends an unlikely messenger on a comic errand. | Ia | a young snake |
| 14: A magician sends an unlikely messenger on a comic errand. | Ib | a clay figure |
| 16: Transition from the summoning of evil forces to spirits which move of their own accord. | | a spirit exorcised |
| 19: A statue walks without any help from magicians and takes revenge if it is not appeased. | IIa | Pellichus |
| 21: A statue walks without any help from magicians and takes revenge if it is not appeased. | IIb | Hippocrates |
| 22: Transition from spirits walking abroad to spirits in Hades. | | Eucrates meets Hecate, who leaves an opening into Hades |
| 24: Description of Hades. | IIIa | from Eucrates |
| 25: Description of Hades. | IIIb | from Cleodemus |
| 26: Transition from Cleodemus, who comes back alive, to Demainete, a genuine *revenant*. | | the man who came back to life over twenty days after burial |
| 27: A ghost has to be appeased by the full burial-rites. | IVa | Eucrates' wife |
| 31: A ghost has to be appeased by the full burial-rites. | IVb | the houseghost |
| 32: Transition from Arignotus, who stayed in the haunted house, to Pancrates, who stayed underground for twenty-three years. | | Democritus, who worked in a tomb |
| 34: A magician sends an unlikely messenger on a comic errand... (?) | Va | Eucrates |
| 35: ... and his apprentice tries the same trick. | Vb | Eucrates |
| 38: Transition—a discussion on oracles. | | |
| 39: Closing frame: Lucian gives up in disgust. | | |

This scheme shows that Schissel was right about the subject-matter: the conversation does glide through the topics in the sequence Magicians-Moving Statues-Hades-*Revenants*-Magicians. But Lucian has organised them on a more rigid framework than Schissel allowed him: there are not seven narrative 'blocks', as he counted, but five; and at least the first four contain two parallel tales. The intervening material overlaps just enough with these pairs to serve as a link in each case. But why should Lucian have made up parallel tales into four groups and allowed the final tale to stand on its own? In *Toxaris* 11 he is quite explicit and balances his two groups of tales in sets of five. Here however he may have felt that the 'sorcerer's apprentice' is really two tales: Pancrates sets up the magic broom; Eucrates tries, with very different results. If not, the story has served to bring the conversation back full circle: Tychiades now sees that his criticisms have been futile, and is ready to leave before Eucrates can finish another story; as soon as the conversation has reached this point, Lucian may have felt that a further tale would be superfluous. Or he may simply have relaxed his self-imposed scheme towards the end. Walz[87] pointed out a similar tendency in *Calumnia*: the author deploys his historical exempla in pairs (8, 14, 16-18, 27-28); but this pattern breaks down at the fifth set, with three at c. 29. One thing is certain: so contrived a scheme must have had its influence once more on Lucian's invention. Each event is as much a variation on its neighbours as on a well-known motif.

In *Toxaris* and *Philopseudes,* then, Lucian reflects the same tendencies and techniques as in *Verae Historiae,*[88] both in his combination of themes and in their arrangement. Yet the contrasting settings and models ensure that each of the three has a rather different nuance from the other two. These differences will be important in dealing with the *Onos* and its problems.

---

[87] S. Walz, *Die geschichtlichen Kenntnisse Lukians,* Diss. Tübingen 1923, 102.

[88] One cannot join Schissel von Fleschenberg, *Rhetorische Forschungen* I. II. (Halle, 1912) in attempting to explain the origins of the novel as such from Lucian's two *Rahmenerzählungen* on the one hand and the testimonia for the *Milesiaca* on the other. A writer of Lucian's versatility has any number of literary reasons for presenting a topic either with or without a frame, and we are no further forward.

## CHAPTER THREE

# THE *ONOS*: THE GREEK FRAME-STORY

At first sight the content of Λούκιος ἢ Ὄνος (hereafter *Onos*) seems far removed from that of *VH*, *Philopseudes* or *Toxaris*: the adventures of a man-turned-ass through the Thessalian countryside do not seem the obvious companion-piece to any of them. Language and ethos are different as well. Yet these three works have the greatest part to play in solving the many questions raised by the *Onos*. Did Lucian write this work as a complement to his other excursions into fiction—or indeed did he write it at all? Even the authorship is only part of a much wider problem.[1] It has long been established that the *Onos* and Apuleius' *Metamorphoses* both derive separately from a lost Μεταμορφωσέων λόγοι διάφοροι ascribed by Photius to an otherwise unknown Lucius of Patras. We have not only to decide whether the *Onos* itself was by Lucian, but why such an epitome came to be written; what the original might reasonably have been like; and above all, how to reconcile any answers with Photius' enigmatic statement on the subject.[2]

Scholars have so far favoured two main possibilities:

(a) Lucius of Patras, otherwise unknown, wrote the Λουκίου μεταμορφωσέων and Lucian abridged it: this allows Photius' judgement to stand.

(b) Lucian himself wrote the original Greek *Metamorphoses*, and the extant *Onos* is a mere epitome by an unknown writer (the view developed by B. E. Perry). On this interpretation, Photius has to make three mistakes: he gives Lucian's work to 'Lucius', the

---

[1] The history of this problem is now in danger of becoming a study in itself, though Perry's view has unified a substantial consensus of opinion behind him. The variations on Perry and his opponents are conveniently enumerated by P. Vallette in his introduction to D. S. Robertson's *Budé* text of Apuleius (2nd edition, Paris 1956). Perry reassembled the substance of his many early contributions to the problem in *The Ancient Romances*, Berkeley, California 1967, 211-282. Advocates of a non-Lucianic original continue in three excellent discussions by A. Lesky (*H* 76, 1941, 43-74); H. van Thiel (*Der Eselsroman, Zetemata* 54.I-II, Munich 1971); and G. Bianco (*La fonte greca delle Metamorfosi di Apuleio*, Brescia, 1971), the latter pair with fundamental bibliographical apparatus throughout.

[2] *Bibl. Cod.* 129 (Ed. R. Henry, *Budé* II p. 103 f.).

hero of the piece, because he has misconstrued Λουκίου μεταμορφωσέων in the title; he then feels obliged to find room for Lucian somewhere, and gives him an anonymous epitome instead; and he sees Lucian's real work—inevitably comic—as serious and superstitious.

The only common ground between these interpretations is that Lucian writes one work but not the other, and both have unsatisfactory implications: either Lucian merely copied or Photius was wildly mistaken. Recently there have been two radical attempts to break the deadlock, both demonstrably unsound.[3] No-one has seriously considered a third view: that Lucian was the writer of *both* works, and so produced an epitome of his own work.[4] I intend to show that this view is at least as tenable as the two generally accepted alternatives; and that it combines the advantages of both the others with the disadvantages of neither: it does justice both to Lucian's practice and Photius' statement.

After the appearance of Perry's dissertation in 1920, no very serious objections to Lucian's authorship of the original were advanced (other than Photius' testimony itself). But in 1971, Helmut van Thiel brought forward a new pseudo-Lucian to take the place of Lucius of Patras,[5] and some new criteria emerge from his investigation. He notes that the author shows close attention to the topography of Thessaly. Since 'Lucius' identifies two of his relatives (55), van Thiel relates their names to the prosopography of the area: this gives him two tentative candidates for authorship, Flavius

---

[3] Bianco, *o.c.* attributes the Greek *Metamorphoses* to an anonymous Greek author *after* the extant *Onos*; but the evidence for Apuleius' dependence on a text fuller than the present *Onos* still holds (e.g. *Onos* 17/*Met.* III.29; 24/*Met.* VI.29; 38/*Met.* VIII.30). Bianco's determination to press this position (close to Wieland's) seems to me to have undermined some of his preliminary discussions on Apuleius' relationship to the lost version: for Bianco's theory to work there must of course be none. Hermann (*AC* 41, 1972, 573-599) adopts the theory that 'Lucius of Patras' wrote both the original and the Latin *Met.*, while Lucian is allowed the extant *Onos*. By this reckoning Lucian's only contribution is to change a few names and retain some of the more risqué material missing from the Latin version! If this is palatable, much of Hermann's method of reaching it is not: there is much flimsy hypothesis converted into fact, especially when Hermann is interpreting cross-references within Lucian himself.

[4] Dismissed briefly by Perry, *CPh* 21 (1926), 234 (without argument).

[5] *Eselsroman*, *o.c.* I.38.

Phoenix and Flavius Phylax of Hypata, a pair of local sophists mentioned by Philostratus (*VS* 604 f.); they may, he argues, have been parodying the *Metamorphoses* of Adrian of Tyre.[6] Lucian is edged out of the *Onos* triangle altogether. He does not know the locality, and his work reflects a totally different approach.[7] This kind of argument is easily unhinged. If Lucian had set out to write a magic tale, where would he have set it, native of Samosata as he was? The answer is of course still Thessaly: we can infer that sophists from Gaul to Egypt could produce an *ecphrasis* of Thessaly at a moment's notice, for the same reasons as they could supply one of Scythia or Libya: Herodotus provides the textbook description readymade (VII.128 ff.). And Lucian has already proved that it does not take a Scythian sophist to write the *Toxaris*! Here all he needs to know is that Hypata is the chief town of Thessaly, and that the name of one other is Larissa. Moreover Lucian had been in both Macedonia and Thrace (*Herod.* 7, *Fugit.* 25); since he has evidently performed in Philippopolis, he must surely know of the existence of Thessalonica and Beroia as well!

Van Thiel also objects to Lucian because Perry chose him for sheer availability; but apart from Photius' explicit connexion of Lucian with the ass-romance, we at least know something about his capabilities and inclinations. We do not have that assurance about Flavius Phoenix of Hypata—and exactly the same objection applies to him. Apart from Lucian we are still clutching at straws: we should at least examine whether there is any common ground between his repertoire and the *Onos*.

## A. LUCIANIC THEMES

A number of van Thiel's remarks on the texture of the work suit Lucian very well. He divides the various strands into proverbs, fable material, witchcraft, adventure, parody romance, and love.[8] The *Onos* is thus shown to be an effective combination of those very sophistic diversions in which Lucian himself was well practised, with an element of religious satire thrown in. But it also offers scope for several of Lucian's specialities: the narrator is a sophisticated animal,[9] or finds himself in a humiliating situation—in the hands

---

[6] *Ibid.* 40 ff.
[7] *Ibid.* 37 f.
[8] *Ibid.* 193-204.
[9] *Gall.* 2 ff., cf. Pan, *Bis Acc.* 9 ff.

of a magician [10] or an enemy,[11] or ill at ease at a dinner.[12] Lucius' general run of adventures belongs to the same milieu as those of Lucian's *Toxaris*—loss at sea,[13] imprisonment on a charge of temple-robbery,[14] a virgin's abduction,[15] and a gladiatorial show.[16] These cases may be little more than the usual themes of the novel;[17] but in the course of collecting linguistic parallels, Perry also noticed a few motifs common to the rest of Lucian and the *Onos*.[18] This list can be greatly expanded.

Most of the 'magic' motifs are found elsewhere in Lucian. Lucius arrives in Thessaly because he is curious to see marvellous sights—the reason Lucian gives for his own travels in *Verae Historiae*.[19] Lucius suggests two magic phenomena he might expect to see—a man in flight or turned to stone. Both are ubiquitous in Lucian, who can petrify one of his characters even in the middle of a philosophic argument! [20] Lucius finds that his host is married to a witch, who turns into a raven to pursue her lover; one of Lucian's magicians uses a winged Cupid to fetch his client's beloved.[21] So far conventional magic props. But the witch's maid Palaestra uses the wrong spell and is unable to undo it immediately. This is a variant of the sorcerer's apprentice, a motif whose first known appearance is in none other than Lucian's *Philopseudes*.[22]

The fable material has also strong connexions with Lucian. The ass is suspected of making approaches to the mares: Lucian uses the proverb τῶν τὰς ἵππους ἀναβαινόντων ὄνων,[23] and I have shown that he frequently allows proverbial material to pass into tales and *vice versa*.[24] He knows a series of proverbs about asses, and although he does not use ἐξ ὄνου παρακυψέως (*Onos* 45) it would certainly be in keeping with his interests. The Ass in due course receives a luxurious

---

[10] Cf. *Neky*. 7-9.
[11] *Onos* 24 ff./*VH* I. 18.
[12] *Onos* 53/*Gall*. 10 f.
[13] *Onos* 34/*Tox*. 19.
[14] *Onos* 41/*Tox*. 28.
[15] *Onos* 22/*Tox*. 52.
[16] *Onos* 53/*Tox*. 58 f.
[17] *Infra*, c. VI.
[18] *CPh* 21 (1926), 226-28.
[19] *Onos* 4/*VH* I.5.
[20] (Flying) *Philops*. 13; (turning to stone) *Vit. Auct*. 25, cf. *Imag*. 1.
[21] *Onos* 12/*Philops*. 14.
[22] *Onos* 13 f./*Philops*. 34 ff.
[23] *Onos* 28/*Eun*. 13.
[24] See *Theme and Variation* 41 n. 5, cf. 45; 123 f.

costume when it becomes an exhibit in the house of Menecles: Lucian several times dresses up incongruous animals in pretentious disguise—monkeys in fine clothes, camels in magnificent trappings, and of course the ass in lion's skin.[25] This soon becomes an essential motif in the plot, when Lucius finds himself in the arena and changes back into a man by eating roses. Now Lucian twice tells the story of the performing monkey who discards its human clothes during a public performance and resumes its own nature by eating nuts.[26] Lucius is made to act out this proverbial story in reverse: he starts off in animal guise and resumes his human form when the right food comes his way.

Sexual themes loom large in the *Onos*, and all of them were in Lucian's repertoire. The ass has to service a rich foreign woman, like Lucian's Alexander.[27] And she receives the ass's organ so that it cannot withdraw: in *VH* two of Lucian's men have a similar experience after their grotesque intercourse with the vinewomen.[28] Lucius, a man-turned-ass, exposes a secret homosexual debauch; in Lucian's *Gallus* we find Pythagoras, turned into a cock, exposing exactly the same crime.[29] Again, Menecles' servants spy on the ass's acts of bestiality through a chink in the door—a variant on one of Lucian's most persistent topoi.[30] At the end of the *Onos* Lucius is to be forced to demonstrate his prowess in public with a bawd. Lucian looks forward at the end of the *Eunuchus* to a situation where a philosopher will have to demonstrate his sexual powers in front of an assessor,[31] and actually compares the victim to an ass on this occasion. Once Lucius has lost his ass's skin, he is thrown out naked; Lucian's adulterer Cantharus is stripped of his lion's skin and exposed in the snow.

There are also a number of other features in the *Onos* which recur often enough in Lucian to be called 'characteristic'. Lucius gatecrashes a meal; the ἄκλητος is one of Lucian's stock figures.[32] The ass is put up for auction and remains unsold, like some of the philosophers in *Vit. Auct.* Or Lucius' sexual initiation is presented

---

[25] *Onos* 48/*Pisc.* 36; *Prom. es* 4; *Fugit.* 33.
[26] *Pisc.* 36/*Apol.* 5.
[27] *Onos* 50/*Alex.* 6.
[28] *Onos* 51/*VH* I.8.
[29] *Onos* 38/*Gall.* 32.
[30] *Onos* 52/*Gall.* 32, *Icar.* 15 f.; *Theme and Variation* 16 f., 106 ff.
[31] *Onos* 52/*Eun.* 12 (cf. Perry, *o.c.* 228).
[32] *Onos* 40/*Conv.* 12; *D. Meretr.* 15.

in terms of a wrestling-match; Lucian describes wrestling holds in some detail in *Anacharsis*,[33] and this would be a natural opportunity to contaminate two more of his interests. One of the robbers suggests that a girl should be sewn up inside the ass and roasted in the sun. This can be seen as a trivial version of the fate of Perilaus, whom Phalaris roasted alive inside a bronze bull: Lucian devotes two whole declamations to the theme.[34] The galli who buy the ass steal a golden bowl, as do most of Lucian's villains.[35] Most noteworthy of all, however, is the revelation scene at the games, when Lucius changes back into a man. The audience is divided about what should be done—again a characteristic dilemma in Lucian, whether at celestial councils, in commitees set up to appoint professors, or for gangs about to lynch their victim.[36] Lucius finds however that the governor at the games knows his father, and he is able to reveal that he himself is a man of letters. This is yet another variation on one of Lucian's most sophisticated topoi—again we can compare *Gallus*, where an animal reveals that he is also a human being in disguise and is a creature of considerable education.[37] The governor is able to protect Lucius from the crowd. Once more this is a well-worn topos: a governor who likes philosophy is able to protect Peregrinus in a difficult situation.[38]

There are some other features which recur less often in Lucian. The galli appear only in *de Dea Syria*; and on quite independent grounds I believe this work to be genuine beyond any doubt.[39] In both works the weird rites of Atargatis are carefully described.[40] The galli impose their goddess on the hospitality of the next village; Lucian makes fun of the Olympians imposing themselves on the Ethiopians.[41] And the goddess is stranded with no-one to carry her; even this little touch recurs in *de Dea Syria*, where Apollo's statue has to agitate for a lift! [42] And one of the galli makes the joke that the priest who bought the ass will give birth to foals; Lucian's

---

[33] *Onos* 9/*Anach.* 1 ff.
[34] *Onos* 25/*Phal.* I.11.
[35] *Onos* 41/*Herm.* 37 ff.; *Icar.* 16; *Conv.* 46 (Perry).
[36] *Onos* 54/*Icar.* 33; *Eun.* 12; *Pisc.* 2 ff.
[37] *Onos* 54/*Gall.* 4 f.
[38] *Onos* 54/*Peregr.* 14; for other examples, *Theme and Variation* 17.
[39] See c. V *infra*.
[40] *Onos* 37/*DS* 50.
[41] *Onos* 41/*Sacr.* 2.
[42] *Onos* 38/*DS* 36.

Micyllus tells Pythagoras that he should have laid eggs (since he is now a cock transmigrated from Aspasia).[43]

The most puzzling feature in the *Onos* is Lucius' identification of himself to the local governor when he regains his human shape: he reveals himself as a writer of ἱστοριῶν καὶ ἄλλων, his brother Gaius as an elegiac poet and a skilled prophet. This has been seen as a means of identifying the author—if he is the same as Lucius—or at least as satirising some rival, whom he puts into the ass.[44] Whatever the answer, there are two techniques here which are characteristic of Lucian. The author decorates the name with 'precise' autobiographical details, a procedure which Lucian is well able to use in any situation: he can provide suitable biographies for any number of unlikely historians, or for strangers inside the whale! A fictitious pedigree for his hero would be no difficulty—and all the more amusing when he has just changed from being an ass. On the other hand the end of *Fugitivi* is a scene where several villains are identified in much more specific terms, as three ex-slaves in Philippopolis. Whether or not the author has any victims in mind here, the surprise comic effect is similar—at a similar point in the work.[45]

## B. STRUCTURE

In this case the arrangement of the extant version is again important. If it is merely an epitome of a work by Lucian, then the familiar patterns which he uses ought at least to be obscured if not completely lost; and the epitomator might be particularly tempted to discard minor episodes in such a prolonged chain of adventures. But as it stands the extant *Onos* has a clearly-defined structure:

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| 1-4: | Lucian arrives at Hypata, and gives the real reason for his quest. | *Introduction* I |
| 5-11: | His affair with Palaestra. | II |
| 12-14: | He is changed to an ass and sets off.[46] | |
| 16-26: | His adventures with the robbers: | *Episodes* |
| | 17: eating roses. | Ia |
| | 23: escaping with the girl. | b |

[43] *Onos* 36/*Gall.* 19.

[44] So van Thiel, *Eselsroman* I.36-42, who searches for a precise identity for Lucius; cf. Perry, who saw satire of a superstitious Roman (*Ancient Romances* 222), and Rohde (*Über Lucian's Schrift* Λούκιος ἢ Ὄνος, Leipzig 1869), who interpreted Lucius as a literary rival. In view of the parallel with *Fugitivi*, I am inclined to suspect that the latter view is right.

[45] 55/*Fugit.* 33, cf. *Merc. Cond.* 42; *Pseudolog.* 18.

[46] This outline shows only Lucius' basic changes of fortune. No account

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| | 26: He escapes being disembowelled when the robbers are captured. | |
| 27-34: | At his rescuer's house: | II |
| | 28: grinding corn. | a |
| | 29: with the slave-boy. | b |
| | 34: He escapes being castrated when his mistress is drowned. | |
| 35-41: | With the galli: | III |
| | 38: betraying an orgy. | a |
| | 40: upsetting a banquet. | b |
| | 41: He escapes being murdered when the galli are imprisoned. | |
| 42-45: | Two more owners: | IV |
| | 42: grinding corn. | a |
| | 43: with the nurseryman. | b |
| | 45: He escapes by accidentally betraying his master. | |
| 46-54: | At Menecles' house: | V |
| | 46: eating human food. | a |
| | 50: copulating. | b |
| | 54: He escapes from the arena by eating roses. | |
| 54-55: | He regains his human shape. | |
| 56: | Another sexual encounter. | |
| | Lucius finally returns to normal life. | |

The writer has used a double prologue, of which the second stage is an elaborate digression. He has also introduced an element of ring composition: Lucius has a sexual encounter immediately before he becomes an ass, and immediately after he resumes his own shape. The enclosed adventures fall clearly into five separate units, each containing two distinct adventures before Lucius' owner has a mishap, or he escapes a bizarre fate. Here too there is ring composition: in I and V Lucian has a new and grotesque liaison with a woman: as the girl's proposed tomb (25), or as a bestial lover (51); and in both II and IV he is put to the mill (28, 42); while the elaborate religious satire, III, forms the centrepiece.

Not only does Lucian use precisely these techniques of grouping and spacing: he employs them in those very works which stand closest to the *Onos* in every other way—*Toxaris* and *Philopseudes*. In the former he devotes the second panel of the introduction to a digression (*Tox.* 5-7), and groups his tales in fives; but in *Philops.*

is taken, for example, of details which do not amount to self-contained episodes: he suffers numerous discomforts at the hands of the robbers, and is eventually lamed (22); but this is only a detail to account for the fact that the robbers leave him behind with the girl. Various stages in his progress through Menecles' household (46 ff.) can be explained in a similar way.

he groups the tales as here in five pairs ABCBA, with an element of ring composition in both inner and outer frame. I have shown elsewhere that Lucian persistently 'transfers' a sequence of events or a basic layout from one work to another, whether for economy or for the sake of sheer ingenuity: this makes it all the more likely that the extant *Onos* was arranged by the same hand as the *Philopseudes.*

## C. HUMOUR

These connexions with *Philops.* and *Tox.* can also help to remove one of the two main obstacles to Lucian's authorship: is the extant *Onos* sufficiently 'funny'? Scholars have continually voiced their disappointment at the comparative lack of satire and malice in the extant work: Perry asks 'why, in making the epitome, he concentrated on the bare action and left out just that kind of thing which was most essential to the satirical meaning of the book as a whole'. Why indeed, when Perry denied him any satire to leave out? He latterly believed that the extant *Onos* represents almost the total bulk of the original;[47] on this view the hypothetical satire in the original has to be concentrated conveniently in those very pages which the epitomator has dispensed with. But was this satire ever there? Lucian could command a wide spectrum of humour; and he could relate fictitious journeys in realistic style (*Navig.* 7-9) with only restrained satirical comment (*Navig.* 10), as well as fantastic extravagances full of parody (*VH*). And he constantly experiments with various blends of material. The *Onos* would offer an ingenious conflation of several elements which he has kept separate elsewhere: a full-length, self-contained tale of magic misadventure too long for *Philopseudes*, but blended with substantial contributions from material similar to that of *Toxaris.* Even within the latter work the element of burlesque varies considerably from tale to tale, with satire subordinated to storytelling: Lucian would be capable of the same priority here.

## D. STYLE

The remaining objection to Lucian's authorship of the *Onos* is the curious Greek, with its bizarre mixture of vulgarisms and poetic words. Whoever its author was, his style is an artificial blend accessible only to a highly literate person by deliberate choice. Knaut,

[47] *Ancient Romances* 223.

Neukamm[48] and Perry have listed a number of contacts between the writer's idiom and Lucian's own: this evidence is sometimes less impressive than it appears, since any 'Lucianic' usage which derives ultimately from a classical author will also be accessible to other sophistic writers.[49] But even if the Lucianic element is reduced to a minimum, this does nothing to weaken Wilhelm Schmid's old argument that Lucian deliberately aimed at *mimische Erzählung* to produce the correct 'low' tone and mock-heroic ethos required by the subject.[50] Is this consistent with Lucian's practice elsewhere? He often appears to enjoy what is best described as linguistic hypocrisy, by indulging at long length in styles which he would otherwise condemn: he sneers at the Ionic affectation of historians, but writes a lengthy excursion in it himself (*DS*); he ridicules Hyperattic jargon (*Pseudolog.* 24, *Rh. Pr.* 16-17), but produces a riotous display of 'anthyperatticism' in *Lexiphanes*; and in *Podagra* he has the opportunity to indulge in the pretentious tragic diction he laughs at so frequently. If Lucian enjoyed these very various literary extremes, why should he not have enjoyed literary 'slumming' and absurd linguistic mixture as well?[51] He could give appropriate vulgarisms to the courtesans in *D. Meretr.*, and even allows the gods a subtle syntactical variation in final clauses.[52] Nor would he be the only littérateur in antiquity to possess a high degree of taste and skill and yet still enjoy linguistic malpractice: Trimalchio's guests speak very differently from Eumolpus, and Petronius indulges with relish in both extremes;[53] or Seneca could turn his hand from Tragedy to the familiar colloquialism of the *Apocolocyntosis*.[54] It would take no more than a preliminary *prolalia* to apologise for the lapses in the *Onos*; and if Lucian were making a deliberate effort to depart

[48] C. F. E. Knaut, *De Lucianio libelli, qui inscribitur Lucius sive asinus auctore*, Diss. Leipzig 1868; V. Neukamm, *De Luciano asini auctore*, Diss. Tübingen 1914; Perry, *CPh* 21 (1926), 225-34.

[49] Hall, *Lucian's Satire* 289.

[50] *NJklAlt* 7 (1904), 485. *Contra* Helm *PW* 1749.

[51] Van Thiel's arguments (*o.c.* I.211-22) are insufficient to show that the author used any specific word-list. The author of *Lexiphanes* was clearly capable of any linguistic tour-de-force—with or without such aid.

[52] J. Deferrari, Lucian's Atticism, *The Morphology of the Verb*, Diss. Princeton 1916, 81; B. J. Sims, *Final Clauses in Lucian*, *CQ* N.S. 2 (1952), 69-72.

[53] See the convenient characterisations in P. G. Walsh, *The Roman Novel*, Cambridge 1970, 45 ff., 122 ff.

[54] For the latter, A. P. Ball (Commentary) Columbia 1902, 68-73.

from his normal idiom, this too would help to explain the relatively thin spread of satire and burlesque which scholars have been able to find in the extant work.

## E. THE TWO GREEK VERSIONS

On the evidence so far discussed Lucian could have written the extant *Onos*. It contains enough distinctive cross-references; it conforms to one of his characteristic patterns of arrangement; and its curious language can still be explained in terms of his practice elsewhere. The strongest objection to this view is that it denies any originality to Lucian, who is made to borrow αὐταῖς τε λέξεσι καὶ συντάξεσιν from an unknown author.[55] But there is no strong objection to making Lucian the author of the original, apart from Photius' statement to the contrary. The point scholars have failed to consider is that both theories are compatible: Lucian may be the author of both original and epitome.[56] This leads us to an obvious objection: while an author can revise a work of his own, Lucian's habit is to make substantial changes when he uses material a second time. This is not the function of an epitome. But *is* the extant *Onos* an epitome at all? A subscription in Γ says so; but Photius implies that there was a marked difference of tone between the two Greek versions:

> . . . ὁ μὲν Λουκιανὸς σκώπτων καὶ διασύρων τὴν Ἑλληνικὴν δεισιδαιμονίαν, ὥσπερ κἀν τοῖς ἄλλοις, καὶ τοῦτον συνέτταττεν. Ὁ δὲ Λούκιος σπουδάζων τε καὶ πιστὰς νομίζων τὰς ἐξ ἀνθρώπων εἰς ἀλλήλους μεταμορφώσεις τάς τε ἐξ ἀλόγων εἰς ἀνθρώπους καὶ ἀνάπαλιν καὶ τὸν ἄλλον τῶν παλαιῶν μύθων ὕθλον καὶ φλήναφον, γραφῇ παρεδίδου ταῦτα καὶ συνύφαινεν.

Few scholars would accept this at its face value: Perry [57] and others assume that Photius grasped the satiric tone of the extant *Onos*, but was entirely wrong to pronounce that the tone of the original was serious. Now if the *Ich-erzählung* of an ass is of itself

---

[55] Perry, *Ancient Romances* 223.

[56] Perry, *CPh* (1926), 234 (but he dismisses the suggestion). Rohde however argued (*Gr. Rom.*$^3$ 429 n. 1) that Xenophon of Ephesus could have been his own epitomator, and cites examples from a number of other fields. Where Lucian's hand is involved we have even more ground for suspicion: and we might further suspect that no second version would see the light as a *mere* epitome.

[57] *Ancient Romances* 217.

comic or satirical, this feature was also present in the original, which must therefore have been funny as well. Hall [58] argues however that Photius merely assumed any work attributed to Lucian to be satirical as a matter of course; on this view, the extant *Onos* need contain no satire either. But Lucius' attack on the priests (36-41) should be read as satire; it enjoys a conspicuous place in the centre of the work, and might easily have coloured Photius' view. On the other hand he shows a wide experience of bizarre secular literature; considering how difficult it is for modern scholars to agree on the 'tone' of the ancient novels,[59] we cannot afford to dismiss his verdict on a lost work out of hand.

Is there any other way that Photius could have gone wrong? It is worth noting that his description would apply tolerably well to both the *extant* versions based on the lost original. The conversion of Lucius in Apuleius *Met.* XI alters the tone of the Latin version very considerably, whatever the author intended in the previous ten books: and it would not be difficult for a casual reader to think of it as giving the whole work a serious 'intention'. Such an effect is of course entirely absent from the extant work, where there is no such conversion scene. When the two extant versions are so totally different in effect—despite the enormous bulk of identical material—we cannot afford to assume that no such difference existed between the two Greek versions. Could Lucian himself have introduced such a difference between two workings of the same theme? Some of the extant doublets in his own work suggest the answer. If Photius had read a group such as *Kataplous* and *Nekyomanteia* against *D. Mort.* 10, he would have been obliged to note that there is some small agreement αὐταῖς τε λέξεσι καὶ συντάξεσι; with no other information available he could easily have attributed *Neky.* to Menippus, the main character, and assumed that Lucian had copied his 'model'; and he might also have deduced that Menippus was superstitious while Lucian was frivolous, on the basis that Menippus relates an absurd *Ich-Erzählung* about his journey to Hades. If Photius had read *de Dea Syria* beside *VH* he might easily have assumed—like many modern scholars—that it is the work of a credulous traveller who could not be identical with the mocking writer

---

[58] Hall, *Lucian's Satire* 289.

[59] It is still possible to take Petronius as fundamentally serious, Apuleius as entirely frivolous, or *vice versa*; Perry and Walsh neatly illustrate the chiastic positions.

of *VH*. These are the kind of mistakes which anyone unfamiliar with Lucian's techniques is liable to make; it is perfectly possible that Lucian wrote an elaborate original version as an ἐσχηματισμένη display,[60] but that he later reduced the story, or rather reworked it, as the extant piece—not merely using an occasional phrase, but recasting the tone so as to produce a different kind of humour. What kind of material would he have needed to include to make the first version different in the shortest space? I suspect that he could have put the Ass through some kind of elaborate religious purification in the original—in the same ἐσχηματισμένη manner as *de Dea Syria*; we have no right to assume that Apuleius was the inventor of this part of the story, though of course he was able to put it to a different use. It is indeed possible that some Comic-conversion-scene suggested to him the idea of serious propaganda for Isis: ludicrous conversions and rituals are no surprise in Lucian.[61]

Of course such an origin for book XI of Apuleius is beyond proof on present evidence. What is important is the fact that Lucian's authorship of both pieces fits the rest of the picture so neatly. Since this hypothesis can be reconciled both to Lucian's practice and Photius' statement, it might at least serve to lessen the dogmatism with which the extreme positions have been advanced hitherto. Until the lost work turns up the difference between the extant versions and Lucian's habits of self-imitation are our only guide.

## F. THE SOURCE OF THE ASS-ROMANCE?

Finally, could Lucian have created, or developed, the original Ass-tale? It is only an assumption that because material about the ass existed already, this particular tale was itself in independent circulation. There was no lack of popular material about the ass in the form of proverbs,[62] and Lucian makes use of several elsewhere.[63] There were also plenty of folktales concerned with animal metamorphosis, a subject again very dear to Lucian;[64] and some material

---

60 For this approach, see *infra* 73.

61 Cf. *Theme and Variation* 83 f. The conversion scene at the end of *Nigrinus* is badly joined to the main body of the work: for the problem as a whole, see Bompaire 509 ff.

62 Van Thiel, *o.c.* I.179 ff.

63 Περὶ ὄνου σκιᾶς (*Herm.* 71/Pl. *Phaedr.* 260); ὁ ἐν τῇ Κύμῃ Ὄνος *Pisc.* 32, *Fugit.* 13; ὄνος λύρας *Adv. Ind.* 4, cf. *Pseudolog* 6, *D. Mar.* 14; τῶν τὰς ἵππους ἀναβαινόντων ὄνων *Eun.* 13.

64 See among many others *Gall.* 2; *VH* II.46; *D. Mar.* 4.

on bestiality.[65] But none of the scraps in ancient literature outside Lucian and Apuleius provide a secure basis for the tale as they present it.

The ass itself had a reputation for lust,[66] and this would be enough to account for an allusion such as Juvenal VI.332 ff.: *hic si/quaeritur et desunt homines, mora nulla per ipsam/quo minus imposito clunem summittat asello.* Macleod thought that this presupposed the existence of a story (*LCL* VIII.51), but Juvenal may well be indulging in his own characteristic exaggeration. We are simply told that some women are lascivious enough to gratify themselves with an animal; this is comparable to his account (X.304 ff.) of a man who will not stop short of an affair with his grandmother: neither passage needs a literary tradition behind it. As to the fragment of Sisenna (10 Bücheler) which Reitzenstein[67] compared with *Onos* 51 (*ut eum penitus utero suo recepit*/ὥσπερ ἀνδρὶ παρακειμένη περιβάλλεταί με καὶ ἄρασα εἴσω ὅλον παρεδέξατο), there is nothing to tell us that the first of these refers to an ass: this is a σχῆμα συνουσίας which one might reasonably expect in any lascivious story; and even if the author of the *Onos* alludes directly to it, there is still no real proof that an ass was involved in the original version.

Students of folklore have been able to collect ample proof of the tale's diffusion, extending from Germany to China. Both K. Weinhold and W. Anderson assumed that a pseudo-Lucian was the author of the Greek version,[68] and so did not consider it in the light of Lucian's own literary methods. Recently van Thiel and Scobie[69] advanced the view that the author himself has contaminated folklore themes in the same free way as he does in the rest of the work. Now metamorphosis was a subject in the sophists' repertoire (Ps.-Menander, Spengel III.393): and there is a useful parallel in Xenophon of Ephesus (II.8.2), where the hero Habrocomes has a dream that in his pursuit of Anthea he is a stallion in search of a mare, and regains his human form on finding her. In its context this motif is simple enough to have been the author's own improvisation rather

---

[65] See Trenkner, *Greek Novella*, *o.c.* 59, 87.

[66] See now A. Scobie, *Apuleius Metamorphoses* I, Meisenheim 1975, 31 and n. 18.

[67] *Das Märchen von Amor und Psyche*, Leipzig 1912, 59 ff. Since then the idea has had a long history: see c. VII. n. 43.

[68] *Sitzungsberichte der Akademie der Wissenschaft zu Berlin* (1893), II.475-88; *Zeitschrift für Volkskunde* 51 (1954), 215-36; 54 (1958), 121-25.

[69] *Der Eselsroman* I.184-6; Scobie, *o.c.* 33.

than a distant variation on some lost *Eselsurquelle*.[70] Neither van Thiel nor Scobie, however, accepted Lucian's authorship of the original. Did he have the basic ingredients for the tale in his own repertoire?

We have already seen his capacity to 'manufacture' or at least embellish folklore.[71] In the *Corpus* there are two cross-references to the basic motifs of the ass-story: in *Neky*. 20 the rich transmigrate into asses for 250,000 years (an allusion to Pl. *R*. 620C, *Phaedo* 81E); and in *Gallus* Lucian gives Pythagoras, transmigrated into a cock, the same kind of *Ich-Erzählung* as Lucius: he too has had his adventures—seeing a robber stealing a vessel,[72] taking part in unnatural vice,[73] and eating strange food;[74] and there is a particularly striking cross-reference, when the ass and the cock both reveal a secret debauch to someone else.[75] Lucian also uses an element of ass-lore in combination with other material at *VH* II.46 (the Asslegs). In the *Onos*, then, he could have set out to blend the account of animal adventures (*Gall.*) with the ass-transmigration (*Neky.*) and the sorcerer's apprentice (*Philops.*)—a tour-de-force of combination. This is not to imply that Lucian would not have used any popular material which came to hand: the robbers' ass carries the betrothed girl back to her lover, as in Phaedrus *app*. 14, where the girl rides the donkey from the rich suitor's wedding back to the poor lover.[76]

---

[70] Ph. Bruneau, *BCH* 89 (1965), 350 ff., attempted to link several representations of a woman's intercourse with an animal to the scene at *Onos* 51, and rightly draws attention to their early date (on lamps of 1st/early 2nd century A.D.). This leads him to believe that Lucian could not have invented the theme. But the links in his argument are extremely tenuous: if these *are* representations of an ass, they still prove no more than we already know: that Lucian could improvise round quite basic situations, as he does in *Philopseudes*. We are dealing with a simple theme of bestiality, which cannot prove that the whole framework existed; or that Lucian did not take the merest hint seen as an illustration and turn it back into literature. But the lamps might in any case represent a horse, in which case the woman might be Semiramis—a point which Bruneau suggests but does not develop.

[71] *Supra* 24 ff.

[72] *Gall.* 14/*Onos* 41.

[73] *Gall.* 19/*Onos* 51.

[74] *Gall.* 5/*Onos* 54.

[75] *Gall.* 32/*Onos* 38.

[76] An important ingredient is the roses; and it has been plausibly conjectured that a local author associated the rose gardens of Midas in Macedonia with the legend of his ass's ears (A. H. Krappe, *CPh* 42, 1947, 288). Since this information was accessible anyway through Herod. VIII.138, we have the attractive possibility that Lucian himself was the first to make the

But the existence of the frame tale before Lucian has still to be proved.

The *Onos* emerges, then, as another *Philopseudes* and *Toxaris*, translated into animal terms in the manner of *Gallus*. It is a similar *plasma* of partly traditional, partly invented material, and maliciously novel treatment. On present evidence, it makes sense that the original at least—and not unreasonably the epitome as well—come from the same author as the other two.

---

association: certainly he has a proved capacity for contaminating Herodotus in any paradoxical way.

CHAPTER FOUR

# THE *ONOS*: THE INSERTED TALES

So far we have considered the problem of who wrote which of the Greek versions. The relationship of Apuleius to the original has proved no less puzzling. He uses a much richer texture than the author of the *Onos*: not only a more lavish style of telling the story of Lucius, but a large number of interpolated tales as well. Did he annex any or all of these when he took over the outline which contains them? The problem is often phrased in a different way: how much longer was the original *Metamorphoses*? Estimates have varied widely: Perry alone thought some 40 Teubner pages in 1920 (i.e. just double the length of the Epitome); in 1967 he settled for only ten.[1] Both positions are still tenable: the two major studies of van Thiel and Bianca appeared simultaneously in 1971, and still take opposite stances: the former restores all but a few of the interpolated tales to an original (which he does not believe to be Lucian's); the latter evacuates them systematically back to Apuleius. This stalemate has existed for more than a century: fresh evidence or new criteria are needed, and Lucian can supply us with at least the beginnings of both.

## A. SOME QUESTIONS OF METHOD

Scholars frequently compare the two extant versions in the hope of finding some tell-tale detail which will 'solve' the riddle once and for all: Junghanns in particular laid stress on studying the 'joinery' of the two versions side by side.[2] But even this kind of analysis allows scope for a good deal of subjectivity: van Thiel points out that Junghanns' purpose was to provide the means for interpreting Apuleius.[3] His approach is entirely successful when he has both extant texts before him: we now know much more about Apuleius' sympathetic handling of character, or his committed attitude to religious events. But Junghanns and his followers have no sympathy for the *Onos* or its origins: Walsh takes an extreme view: 'the main

[1] *Ancient Romances* 369 n. 5.

[2] *Die Erzählungstechnik von Apuleius' Metamorphosen und ihrer Vorlage*, *Ph Suppl.* 24. 1 (1932).

[3] *Eselsroman, o.c.* 22 n. 63.

point of such investigations as these should be the enrichment of our appreciation of *The Golden Ass*, rather than the consideration *in vacuo* of an unknown book of unknown length by an unknown author'.[4] But such an approach is of rather limited value when dealing with material which *only* occurs in Apuleius—all the more so when Walsh accepts Lucian as an attractive candidate for authorship of the original. The difficulty is that between them Apuleius and the epitomator are liable to produce conditions which make any further probing practically impossible. First of all there are certain cases where it is impossible to tell whether material is being added by Apuleius or subtracted by the epitomator. If the *Onos* tells us that the characters spent the night talking and Apuleius tells us what they talked about, there will be complete stalemate; so too if Apuleius has three tales where the epitomator has none. It is all very well to suggest that Apuleius liked to add tales in threes: but if the tales are obviously independent of the *Onos* plot, there is no reason why the *original* author should not have inserted the tales himself, and the epitomator consistently subtracted precisely this material. It is even more misleading to attempt to decide the length of the original on the strength of a Teubner page-count: it should already be clear from the epitome that the work is strongly individual anyway. In such a case, as with Petronius, we cannot be too precise about its original shape.

Secondly, there is a frequent risk of simultaneous discrepancies in the extant versions. Apuleius is a highly disorganised writer, so much so that practically nothing is a surprise. Where the *Onos* is only slightly obscure and Apuleius is wildly independent, we have to reckon with careless cutting *and* slapdash addition, and this does not help us to establish what was there in the first place. In Apuleius I.24 f. Lucius goes out on a futile expedition to buy fish because his host Milo is such a miser, a fact which does not prevent Milo from offering him a meal when he comes back with nothing. It is no consolation to find in the epitome that Lucius is enjoying a generous meal supplied by his miserly host. Is this careless improvisation by an epitomator trying to 'write out' an anecdote in his original? If not, something has still gone wrong with both: can we therefore afford to assume that Apuleius invented the incident in the market?

[4] *CR* 24 (1974), 218.

Thirdly, Junghanns' analysis has enriched Apuleius only at the expense of the epitome: once we have assigned all the extra material to the former, the epitomator has nothing to epitomate; for all he cut he might as well not have bothered; and Photius implies on the contrary that his task involved some degree of selectivity.

A further complication has been the erratic course of scholarship itself: Perry's argument for Lucian's authorship took some time to establish itself, and most of his successors have felt free to assume that the original author is unknown, so that they need only argue on the basis of the two extant texts.[5] Even if we choose to advance Lucian's authorship only as a competent and viable hypothesis, it still obliges us to take a closer look at the rest of Lucian: so repetitive an author would surely have found room for some more of his repertoire in an enlarged version.

Our first task should be to identify some of the undistributed middles which Junghanns and others have allowed into the problem. One prevailing misconception is that Apuleius is the only author of the group who is 'allowed' to contaminate two separate narrative motifs.[6] It would certainly be difficult to envisage a more baroque narrative than the tales of Aristomenes, Thelyphron, or the stepmother and the physician; but at least some of the *bizarrerie* is due to Apuleius' way of retelling anything: if he retells a tale which someone else has synthesised it will sound just as bizarre as if he himself had joined it up.[7] The difficulty is that Lucian also engaged in *contaminatio*, in some cases with equally absurd results: Toxaris' third tale is not a masterpiece of self-consistency, narrative economy, or clarity of plot; and even Mnesippus' first tale changes direction very obviously in the middle—from a story of adulterous in-

---

[5] Bürger (*de Lucio Patrensi*, Diss. Berlin 1887) and Morelli (*Apuleiana IV*, *SIFC* 21, 1915, 119-157), wrote before Perry's original dissertation was published in 1920: they could not therefore test any extra material they assigned to the original. Junghanns and Lesky (*H* 76, 1941, 43-74) adopted opposing positions over the issue of 'pruning' the original, but both still believed in Lucius of Patras (so too Paratore, *La novella in Apuleio*², Messina 1942). Van Thiel, who comes full circle back to Bürger, has another name to put in his place. I offer the present corollary to Perry before his very reasonable hypothesis is lost sight of amid the rising tide of new ones.

[6] Perry goes further, *Ancient Romances* 300: the Latin author of *Apollonius of Tyre* must be a contaminator, because '*Contaminatio* is a peculiarly Latin literary phenomenon'. It is not hard to see the consequences of applying this strange conviction to the study of the *Onos*.

[7] As Perry's first example illustrates, *Ancient Romances* 254 f.

trigue told for its own sake to a conventional exemplum about a faithful friend—with a convenient murder en route (*Tox.* 12-18); how much more bizarre would it have appeared in Apuleius' hands—even without any further additions?

Another of the unfortunate convictions which persists in the *Onos*-problem is the idea that only Apuleius is inclined to repeat himself: the lost original was no doubt a model of economy and self-consistency![8] But if Lucian had anything to do with the authorship this would not necessarily be the case. He allows himself a very high proportion of repetition and variation throughout his work, even within the collections of tales, as in Mnesippus' first and last stories in *Toxaris*. Again, Apuleius' preoccupation with *Dreizahlkeit* is well known, and so is its magical significance.[9] It is inconvenient for those who proclaim this as 'Apuleian' that the sceptical and irreligious Lucian should have similar tendencies. I have shown elsewhere that the main parts of his dialogues tend to fall into three: he is as aware as Apuleius of Pliny's *scholastica lex*.[10] Van Thiel falls into a similar trap when he prejudges the original Greek author's literary preferences: he is not interested in such 'Apuleian' preserves as Egyptian religion and Mysteries, *ecphrases*, legal details and trial scenes, moralistic reflexions, and just rewards for evildoers.[11] In fact Lucian is interested in all of these to a greater or lesser degree, particularly *ecphrases* and trial-scenes.[12] When he is even a possible candidate for authorship, it is unsatisfactory to assume that there was no trace of *ecphrasis* in the original.[13]

The inserted tales have seldom been studied in the past, except to illustrate the student's own concept of *Apuleianitas*.[14] Their sources and motifs are usually treated as secondary, and are still

---

[8] This is the implication throughout Junghanns' *Erzählungstechnik*: see his index *s.v. Motivwiederholung, Situationsverdoppelung.*

[9] Junghanns laid particular stress on tripartite interpolations; see also A. Scobie, *More essays on the Greek Romance and its Heritage*, Meisenheim 1973, 81 f.

[10] *Theme and Variation* 161 f.

[11] *Eselsroman, o.c.* I.23.

[12] See for example Bompaire 707-33; 242-63; 233, 234 and n. 1.

[13] In *Met.* II.4 Lucius sees a sculptural group depicting Actaeon and Diana—obviously 'anticipating' his own adventure. But Lucian uses a similar device at the beginning of *Toxaris* (6): the *ecphrasis* of Orestes and Pylades neatly prefigures the elements of loyalty and violence in the subsequent Scythian tales.

[14] E.g. J. Tatum, *TAPhA* 100 (1969), 487-527.

wide open: a sophist could draw directly on poetic material, prose collections, historiography, or direct acquaintance with popular tradition.[15] But there is one source we should consider first. We have already seen what kind of novellae Lucian was able to manufacture and retouch. Elsewhere I have studied his capacity for re-siting motifs and combining them in new literary contexts.[16] How do his motifs and methods compare with those of the material now in Apuleius?

B. THE TALE OF ARISTOMENES (I.2-20)

The narrator joins a pair already in the midst of discussing a supernatural tale.[17] This is similar to the opening incident in Lucian's *Philopseudes*, where his spokesman Tychiades interrupts a conversation on quack cures which soon leads into ghost stories.[18] Another motif in the presentation also recurs in Lucian: the listener becomes impatient and asks his friend to come down from his tragic pose: this is exactly how the interlocutors react in both *Nekyomanteia* and *Nigrinus*.[19]

The tale itself opens with two motifs familiar from Lucian's *Toxaris*: Aristomenes rediscovers his old friend Socrates, now living in squalor. Lucian's Demetrius finds his long-lost companion Antiphilus imprisoned and unrecognisable.[20] Now Socrates has been ruined by acquaintance with a courtesan: Lucian's Deinias is reduced to desperation for Charicleia, and has to be rescued by his faithful friend Agathocles;[21] young Glaucias in *Philopseudes* falls victim to the courtesan Chrysis; or Philematium in *D. Meretr.* is preparing to ruin Charmides. In due course the witches take away Socrates' heart and replace it: we can compare Lucian's description of magical operations in *Philopseudes* or *D. Meretr.*[22] In all three cases the practitioners carefully leave things as they found them. Aristomenes watches all this from under the bed: the witches urinate

---

[15] Perry 253.
[16] *Theme and Variation*, esp. cc. I and III; *supra* 20.
[17] Perry argues that Apuleius clumsily contaminated the tale (*CPh* 24, 1929, 394-400; *Ancient Romances* 259-64). But Lucian is just as liable to be the contaminator, especially where magic is concerned; and a tragic performance, like that of Aristomenes, is an equally irresistible device.
[18] I.2.5 ff./*Philops.* 7 ff., 11 f.
[19] I.8.5/*Neky.* 1, *Nigr.* 12.
[20] I.6.1 ff./*Tox.* 30.
[21] I.9.1 ff./*Tox.* 13-17, *Philops.* 14 f.; *D. Meretr.* 11.3.
[22] I.12 f./*Philops.* 14; *D. Meretr.* 4.4 f.

over his body. Now in a rather different setting Lucian's dead tyrant Megapenthes watches as his courtier makes free with his former mistress;[23] his corpse is then spat upon, and like Aristomenes he can do nothing about it.[24] Aristomenes addresses his bed: in Lucian the tyrant's bed is later invoked as a witness.[25] Socrates now dies of invisible wounds: this is also the fate of Eucrates' servant in *Philopseudes* 21. The stopper which the witches had left in his neck jumps out when he crosses water. This motif could easily have been adapted from the story of Talus the Cretan, who had a similar stopper in his heel. For anyone using the *Philopseudes*, Lucian alludes to Talus just before he describes the servant's fate (19): contamination of the two motifs—by either author—would easily produce Apuleius' version.[26]

### C. LUCIUS AND PYTHEAS (I.24 f.)

The incident in the fish-market is one of the most puzzling: Lucius buys fish at an exorbitant price, and meets his old friend Pytheas, now superintendent of markets, who complains to the stall-holder. Pytheas stamps on the fish, leaving Lucius with neither fish nor money. Why? The incident seems unrelated to the thread of the story; and the encounter with a friend looks like a clumsy duplicate of the meeting with Byrrhaena, which appears in the extant *Onos* and is therefore part of the original.[27] These considerations have in the past been taken as reasonable proof that the incident was invented by Apuleius.[28] There is also the suspicion of a biographical element: fish played an important part in Apuleius' *Apology* (though scarcely an identical one), and Pytheas may be seen as a reminiscence of Apuleius' student days at Athens.[29] But the matter does not end there. Lucian does not look the likely place for the story, but he does offer two very similar components. Lucius here returns home at night, his expectations of supper disappointed; so does Zeus in *J. Trag.*, since he has been left with a single cock instead of the whole hecatombs he had been promised.[30] Secondly, Lucian does have an odd fantasy about over-priced fish, where one

[23] I.13.8/*Katapl.* 12.
[24] I.16/*Katapl.* 12.
[25] I.16.2 ff./*Katapl.* 27.
[26] I.19.9/*Philops.* 19-21.
[27] II.2.2 ff., cf. *Onos* 4 (Abroia).
[28] After Junghanns 126n. 11; van Thiel I.66 and n.42.
[29] M. Hicter, *AC* 13 (1944), 95-111; 14 (1945), 61-68.
[30] I.25.6/*J. Trag.* 15.

of the details corresponds to the situation here: in *Piscator* Lycinus shows a Peripatetic porcupine-fish to Aristotle, who orders it to be thrown back over the cliff.[31] The 'student friend' recurs in Lucian's tales of adventure;[32] and so does the 'helpful encounter', where one meets an old friend in an unlikely place ready to offer help.[33] There are other scraps: in *Merc. Cond.* the young philosopher is humiliated by officious servants in the same manner as Lucius is left here;[34] amid an expensive banquet he is liable to be left with neither food nor adequate fee; or a chef will spoil the fish before it reaches the victim's plate.[35] And Lucian tells an equally irrelevant story about how one Mausacus bought cheap fish at Caesarea—to show how trivial such an incident is in the context of serious history.[36] At first sight attempts to connect the trampled fish with an Egyptian curse seem highly improbable, or at any rate much more probable in Apuleius than in Lucian.[37] But it is worth noting that Lucian describes a rite in the *de Dea Syria* in which Hera has to go to the sacred fishpond first, so that Zeus will not see and destroy the fish.[38]

None of these many partial resemblances will 'account' for Apuleius' version; but they show us that the raw material of the anecdote is already available in Lucian. There may have been a common source in Old Comedy, or Lucian himself may have been the author: or some hints in Lucian may have been expanded by Apuleius into the present *plasma*; but we can no longer assume that it was a spontaneous creation in the text of Apuleius.

## D. THE TALE OF DIOPHANES (II.14)

A magician gives the merchant a good weather forecast. A friend of the magician's then appears, to hear that his cargoes have been

---

31 *Pisc.* 50.

32 *Tox.* 21; 27.

33 For the helpful encounter, *Scytha* 3 ff., *cf. Icar.* 13; *Fugit.* 29.

34 *Merc. Cond.* 26.

35 *Sat.* 23.

36 *Hist.* 28.

37 Perry, *CPh* 36 (1941), 308; P. Derchain and J. Hubaux, *AC* 27 (1958), 100-104; P. Grimal, *REA* 73 (1971), 343-355.

38 *DS* 47 (see Harmon, *LCL* IV.398 n. 1). None of this of course excludes the obvious satire of petty officialdom (Junghanns 126). But I am not so sure that it is parallel to the episode in Petronius *Sat.* 12 ff., which also takes place in a market. That is after all a case of theft discovered. It seems unwarranted to claim 'it is clear that the market-place anecdote is a favourite Milesian type in which the narrator recounts his discomfiture' (Walsh, *Roman Novel* 88, cf. 151).

shipwrecked. Everybody laughs, and the merchant takes his money back.[39] This is a variant on the well-worn theme of the pretentious sham, humiliated in public when he fails to practise what he preaches. Lucian rings several changes on the formula; a eunuch is claiming a chair of philosophy, when an old acquaintance reveals that he was caught in adultery—to everyone's amusement;[40] or Hermotimus praises his great teacher, until Lycinus points out that the latter had been dunning his pupils for debt the day before;[41] later an angry guardian refuses to pay because of the teacher's hypocrisy. Lucian also has two variations in a nautical context: in *J. Trag.* the foolish Stoic commends Providence for being a good pilot: his opponent reveals that the ship is really heading for the rocks—and the Stoic is a laughing-stock.[42] Or in *Navigium* Adimantus does not prophesy but dreams of a wonderful voyage; Lycinus brings him down to earth by showing that the ship will sink.[43] Equally interesting is a case in *Alexander* 45, where every theme here is reversed. Alexander the quack prophet prophesies that a man has been shipwrecked. The man turns up to prove that he was not. Instead of laughing at Alexander, the audience stones an innocent man who reveals the truth.[44] Again Lucian has no completely parallel version, but was thoroughly conversant with all the motifs required to form this tale —and manipulated them elsewhere in the most flexible manner.

### E. THELYPHRON (II.18-30)

The story of Thelyphron is the most bizarre and elaborate pastiche: the 'hero' undertakes to guard a corpse, contracting to substitute his own limbs for any missing parts of the corpse's. He falls asleep, but finds the corpse still intact in the morning. The dead man's widow is denounced as an adulteress and the corpse has to be called to give evidence: he 'proves' his authenticity by demonstrating that the mutilation took place after all; he still has his nose and ears intact, while Thelyphron has artificial ones which

---

[39] This version has been compared to the fable (*Aes.* 161) quoted by O. Crusius, *Ph* 47 (1889), 448, where the sham is told that his house has been robbed. But the original author was as likely as Apuleius to draw on such a source.

[40] *Eun.* 10 f.

[41] *Herm.* 9.

[42] *J. Trag.* 46 ff.

[43] *Navig.* 18 f.

[44] *Alex.* 44 f.

come off in his hand: the witches had cut them off during the night when he had answered to the same name as the dead man.

Perry tried to show in great detail that this is a synthetic tale, by pointing to a number of inconsistencies.[45] But in fact Apuleius is such a careless writer that inconsistencies are by no means confined to the 'joints' between incongruous parts of tales. In fact such difficulties are inevitable in *any* long tale and need not be due to Apuleius; once more Lucian does equally badly in *Toxaris.* It is much safer to take the smallest components—the narrative motifs—one by one:

(1) The hero is abroad in a strange city—like Lucian's Toxaris in his own tale.[46] (2) He takes on the task of performing a vigil over a corpse, as Lucian's Arignotus does in the haunted house.[47] (3) Parts of the hero are to be 'mortgaged' as substitutes for any mutilation done to the corpse. Lucian has no exact parallel to this 'devil's bargain'; but in another of Toxaris' tales, we find that a man is given back his friend in return for his own eyes; or in *DS* a faithful servant entrusted with guarding the queen 'deposits' his genitals as a guarantee of her safe return.[48] (4) Thelyphron is attacked by the servants and thrown out for an inopportune remark, implying that there will be a subsequent death in the family. Perry maintains that 'such horseplay is peculiarly Roman and Apuleian and impertinent'.[49] Is it? Lucius himself suffers the same fate at the end of the *Onos,* when the rich woman's servants throw him out naked into the street.[50] And in Lucian's *Lexiphanes* 11 we find Eudemus describing how he revived a dying man in terms which suggest that he was actually killing him. And *faux pas* of any kind are a fixation of Lucian's.[51] (5) A man comes forward and denounces the widow as an adulteress. Last-minute surprises of this kind come easily to Lucian: in *Eunuchus* Bagoas is denounced for adultery at a public enquiry. And he frequently gives

---

[45] *CPh* 24 (1929), 231-238, cf. *Ancient Romances* 264-273. Walsh prefers only two parts, 154 n. 1; Brotherton, *CPh* 29 (1934), 36 ff., takes it as a unity. It is rather like material from *Philopseudes* worked up to the scale of Toxaris' third tale.

[46] II.21.3/*Tox.* 57 f.

[47] II.21.5 ff./*Philops.* 31.

[48] II.22.6/*Tox.* 40; *Dea Syria* 20.

[49] *CPh* 24 (1929), 233.

[50] II.26.6/*Onos* 56.

[51] They form the subject of *pro Lapsu inter salutandum* and *Pseudologistes.*

accounts of adultery itself: in *Philops.* 14 it is combined with magic. (6) Thelyphron finds that he has lost his nose and ears: now Lucian knew Herodotus' story of Zopyrus (III.153), which he adapts in *de Dea Syria*: Herodotus' hero there mutilates himself in precisely this way, and in due course reveals his plight.

Perry accepted that this story was the work of Apuleius. It is 'a long digression from the main story, alien in kind and to the style and method of the original *Luciad*' [52] which he accepts as Lucian's. Accordingly he tried to reconstruct the 'original' story of guarding the corpse as a Roman mime. This is plausible enough speculation: but it is all too clear that Lucian had the themes and inclination to construct such a *plasma* in his own right. Some of the supposed inconsistencies might be due to Apuleius' careless enthusiasm, but the story is a much more ingenious synthesis than Perry allows, and Lucian could all too easily be behind it.

### F. THE RISUS-FESTIVAL (II.31-III.18)

Next, an equally complicated affair: Lucius finds three robbers knocking at the door, and kills them in turn. When he is about to be condemned at the trial, the whole affair turns out to be a practical joke: the men were only animated wineskins, and had arrived at the door through a mistake in the witch's spell; Lucius is the victim of a local festival of laughter.

It has long been clear that this tale is as strange a combination as its predecessor.[53] But less has been said about the sources of each individual motif. Most of these are again familiar:

(1) The narrator comes along in time to discover three men at the mistress' door. A similar motif occurs in Lucian's *Fugitivi*, where Hermes and his assistants find three dubious slaves making their exit from the house where they are holding a married woman captive.[54]

(2) The narrator has a comic battle with ghosts, and gives an overblown account of it later. This motif is best illustrated from Lucian's *Philopseudes*, where the philosopher Arignotus gives an inflated version of how he wrestled with a ghost: instead of the routine exorcism, he gives his most terrible oath, and lays the shade by fisticuffs.[55]

[52] *Ancient Romances* 276.
[53] Perry, *AJPh* 46 (1925), 253-262 (cf. *Ancient Romances* 273-280).
[54] II.32.2 ff./*Fugit.* 31.
[55] II.32.4 ff., III.5.1 ff./*Philops.* 31.

(3) A mock trial, where the narrator himself is attacked. There may be an 'autobiographical' element here: [56] but we may note how often Lucian places himself in some extraordinary trial situation: in *VH* II.9 even the handcuffs turn out to be a sham (floral wreaths which fall off on acquittal:); and in *Bis Acc.* 26 ff. he has two successive wrongful accusers Rhetoric and Dialogue.[57]

(4) An amusing revelation: the victims are really wineskins in disguise. Again Lucian can offer several approaches to this unusual motif: in VH he draws his sword and runs through a witch, who turns to water, or his own companions turn to vines; and in *Piscator* not only is he himself on trial, but his philosopher opponents flee the court and turn up again as—fish! [58] Or in *Bis Accusatus*, in imitation of Cratinus' Πυτίνη, Drunkenness herself enters the court and accuses Polemo; [59] and in Neky. 11, in imitation of Pl. *Phaedo* 101D, shadows are in court as accusers.[60] Lucian was well able to conflate these convergent motifs into the present tale.

(5) A curious festival—of laughter! Lucian knows of a plague of tragic acting, which infects the whole city of Abdera; or an annual feast of talking, in India.[61] Several of his trial-scenes dissolve into laughter; [62] and he devotes a whole dialogue to the Saturnalia.[63]

(6) After all his humiliation, Lucius is offered a statue by the community; he rejects it politely. This is reminiscent of *Timon* 51, where Timon is to be given a statue by Athens for services not performed, and refuses it.[64]

(7) The truth comes out later: the assistant Fotis had substituted hair from the skins for the lover's hair, so that her mistress summoned the wrong victim. Lucian has another variation on this theme: in *Philops.* 25 Hermes went to the wrong door and sent the wrong victim down to Hades.[65]

---

[56] III.2 ff.; M. Hicter, *o.c.*

[57] *VH* II.9 ff.; *Bis Acc.* 26, 33.

[58] III.9.9/*VH* II.46; *ibid.* I.8; *Pisc.* 44-51.

[59] *Bis Acc.* 15 f.

[60] *Neky.* 11.

[61] *Hist.* 1; *Bacch.* 6 f.

[62] *Eun.* 11; *J. Trag.* 51 ff.

[63] There is no need to presuppose a genuine festival, as reconstructed by D. S. Robertson, *JHS* 39 (1919), 110-115, comparing Dawkins, *JHS* 26 (1906), 191-206. But of course no amount of elaboration by Lucian or Apuleius can preclude some basis of fact.

[64] *Timon* 51 f.

[65] *Philops.* 25. Walsh argues that 'there is no trace of this scene in Lucius

All this gives us a simple outline: a stranger arrives in town: through his misfortunes he is embroiled in a curious festival. He wins a strange battle and is cheered by spectators. Lucian has constructed a different tale on this same outline: in *Toxaris* 57-8 the narrator is a Scythian in a Greek town. His companion undertakes to enter a gladiatorial show (which of course bewilders him); he kills his man and is cheered by the spectators. Another equally obvious *plasma* contains the remaining motifs of Apuleius' version: Lucius is baited by a cunning advocate for the crowd's amusement; in Dio Chrysostom's *Euboicus* [66] the native of Euboea is given the same treatment before he too is released by a timely intervention: grudges against irresponsible accusation are not confined to Apuleius.[67]

G. THE ROBBERS' TALES (IV.8-22; VII.6-8)

After Lucius has been changed into an ass and captured by the robbers, they tell three stories about men they have just lost.[68] Now in general Lucian was interested in *Räuberromantik*: these tales have the same bravado flavour as the 'gallant' Scythian tales in *Toxaris*: and there the great central tale traces the individual fortunes of three friends in equally incredible exploits. The synthetic names used by Apuleius (Lamachus, Alcimus, Thrasyleon) are fully consistent with Lucian's own practice. Lamachus' arm is caught in a door; he is cut away by friends who refuse to kill him themselves, but bury his corpse with honour.[69] There is no detailed parallel in Lucian for the incident: it is a reminiscence of two well-known tales in Herodotus, where a brilliant robber leaves a substitute hand with Rhampsinitus' daughter; and Cynegirus loses his arm

---

or the Ass: Apuleius has here drawn on his own resources to shape the portrait of the witch'. But Lucian develops such portraits extensively elsewhere (*Philops. passim*; *D. Meretr.* 4.4).

[66] *Or.* VII.27 ff.

[67] Perry accepts only the wineskins as part of the original (*AJPh* 46, 1925, 253-62): it fits well with a slight lacuna at *Onos* 11. But again it is not necesary to suppose that we now have a clumsy synthesis entirely due to Apuleius.

[68] The robbers' exploits provide two of the generally acknowledged lacunae in the *Onos* version: there is plainly room in *Onos* 22 for a discussion of the robbers' recent exploits (even if they are not necessary to explain why the ass is a bird of ill-omen to the robbers, as Lesky ingeniously argued, 55); and even Junghanns (77) allowed the lacuna in 26, since Tlepolemus must have prior knowledge of the robbers' haunts which the *Onos* does not mention. Only Bianco is forced by his own thesis to deny it (*o.c.* 72 ff.).

[69] IV.11.

at Marathon.[70] But the general sequence is fully in the manner of *Toxaris*: (dramatic rescue, bizarre mutilation, faith unto death); and Lucian is well able to synthesise amusing episodes from bits and pieces of Herodotus.

In the second tale a cunning woman distracts the robber's attention with some quick thinking, and gets the better of him. Lucian has a similar story in a quite different context: a doctor outwits a mad fluteplayer by the same means again in an upstairs room.[71]

The third tale concerns a robber who disguises as a bear to gain access to a rich household. The trick misfires and the bear turns out to be a deathtrap when it is attacked by hounds. Now the original *Onos* itself contains a similar event, when the robbers decide to bind the heroine inside the Ass's skin:[72] apart from that we have a straightforward mythical improvisation (Trojan horse, bull of Phalaris, Actaeon). The heroic battle itself is reminiscent of Lucian's Scythians battling with the lion (*Tox.* 42).[73]

There is a further account at the end of the episode: they are betrayed by an enemy in disguise, who masquerades as a famous robber, and tells an elaborate lying tale. Such a yarn is once more an integral part of the *Toxaris*, where Arsacomas' friend Lonchates tells an elaborate cock-and-bull story to the king of Bosporus.[74] The tale itself draws together a number of other motifs found in *Toxaris*: a high official in disgrace has a faithful wife who shares his misfortunes, repulses an attack from the robbers, and appeals to Caesar. The faithful companion sharing his friend's exile occurs in two of Lucian's tales;[75] and a third collects all the other elements: at *Tox.* 24 ff. a high official of Marseilles is in disgrace, and his friend proves his faith by marrying his ugly daughter, then restoring her father's fortune by appeal to the assembly.[76]

---

[70] Herod. II.121; VI.114.

[71] IV.12/*Conv.* 20.

[72] IV.14 ff./*Onos* 25. Van Thiel (I.105 f.) assigns this tale to Apuleius on the grounds that its tone is different from that of the other two, and that it lacks the ironic wit associated with the tales he assigns to the original. But the very same observations could be made about the tale in *Toxaris* to which I compare it: Lucian is not uniformly witty all the time, and Belitta and Basthes have a rather tame adventure in contrast to the incredible bravura on either side.

[73] IV.20 f./*Tox.* 43. Lucian himself wrote two declamations on Phalaris; and *Onos* 25 is a grotesque translation of the theme into realistic guise.

[74] VII.5.4 ff./*Tox.* 49.

[75] VII.6.3 ff./*Tox.* 18; 32 ff.

[76] VII.6.2; 7.3/*Tox.* 24 ff.

### H. THE TALE OF CHARITE (VIII.1-14); VARIA

Thrasyllus is a rejected suitor of Charite with blood on his hands. Her husband Tlepolemus takes him in, only to be killed by his guest in a boar hunt. Thrasyllus then resumes his designs on Charite.[77] This is a simple combination of Herodotus' story of Adrastus with an added erotic motif.[78] In Herodotus the fugitive guest kills his host's son by accident: here he is the determined suitor premeditating murder. Lucian knows the Adrastus story; and he used the rejected suitor as the central thread of the main tale in *Toxaris*.[79]

Thrasyllus woos the faithful widow, but her husband's ghost tells all. She makes a secret assignation with Thrasyllus to become his mistress, but blinds him in his drunken sleep. This is an amalgam of the story of Kamma and Sinorix and perhaps the blinding of the Cyclops:[80] Lucian used the latter motif; and blinding also appears as a punishment in *Toxaris*.[81] It only remains for Charite to commit suicide in a fit of madness, and for Thrasyllus to slay himself on the tomb. Lucian frequently accumulates murder and intrigue in this manner.[82]

Several minor incidents follow: in an enchanted wood the ass's shepherds find a child being eaten by a snake; in Lucian a vine-dresser is bitten by a snake as a prelude to the magic tales in *Philopseudes*.[83] In the next incident a lascivious servant is punished by being tied to a tree and eaten by ants. This partly overlaps the robbers' punishment for Charite in the *Onos*, where she is to be trapped inside the ass and eaten by maggots.[84] When Lucius in

---

[77] There are formidable objections to assigning this tale to the original: the epitome gives Charite and Tlepolemus a very brief death by drowning (34). But the epitome's version here is surprising (Junghanns 84), if not totally unconvincing (Rothstein, *Quaestiones Lucianeae*, Berlin 1888, 130; Lesky, *o.c.* 63), and reads like a stopgap: did the epitomator despair of summarising a complicated intrigue and substitute a feeble improvisation? (*Contra* van Thiel I.22, Bianco 80; but the doubts remain).

[78] VIII.4.1 ff./Herod. I.34 ff.

[79] *Tox.* 44 ff.

[80] VIII.10.2 ff./Plut. *Mor.* 257E; 768B. For a detailed comparison, see H. Erbse, *Eranos* 48 (1950), 108 ff. But this still leaves room for manoeuvre: contamination with Herodotus would be characteristic of Lucian, as in *Tox.* and *DS*; the device of *revenants* is equally so.

[81] *D. Mar.* 2.2; *Pseudolog.* 27; *Tox.* 40.

[82] VIII.14.1 ff./*Icar.* 15, *Gall.* 25, *Katapl.* 8-12.

[83] VIII.21/*Philops.* 11.

[84] VIII.22.5 ff./*Onos* 25.

due course falls into the hands of the galli, Apuleius describes how they impose oracles on the simple country folk, giving favourable responses to suit their needs. This is exactly the basic theme of Lucian's attack on Alexander of Abonoteichos, and of his frequent parodies of prayers.[85] The short and grotesque *ecphrasis* at IX.33 ff. can also be considered here: a hen lays a fully-formed chicken; a fountain of blood appears under the table; the wine is boiled out of its jars, and various other portents occur. These are clearly more Roman than Greek, though sequences of ludicrous marvels do occur for good measure in *Philops.* and *VH.* Next, three brothers help a poor man in a boundary dispute with a tyrannic rich man. The first is set on by wild dogs (cf. the tale of the robber Demochares); another is impaled by a spear; the third kills the master then himself; and finally their stricken father kills himself. Once more the components are familiar: Toxaris' third tale revolves round three men who fight together, though in that case they are successful.[86] And boundary disputes between the arrogant man and his poor neighbour are a standard feature of Lucian's repertoire.[87]

### I. MISCELLANEOUS TALES OF ADULTERY AND INTRIGUE (IX-X)

In IX.4-7 the husband comes home early and the wife is caught red-handed. This is a stock opening for any spicy story: Lucian used a similar situation at *Toxaris* 13.[88] Thereafter the tale takes a different turn: the wife has hidden the lover in a tub, which the husband commandeers. She pretends that the lover is a buyer inspecting the tub, and finishes her business with him on top of the tub while the husband cleans it out underneath. There is a precedent for this in Petronius, where Eumolpus' man is under the bed while he and the girl are performing on top.[89] The basic motif of the tale is the smart adulterer in a tight corner: but it might again be a re-moulding of mythical motif, after the story of Juppiter, Juno, and Io.[90]

Next, the baker's wife discusses her lover with a bawd, who

---

[85] IX.8/*Alex. passim,* cf. *Icar.* 26; *Sacr.* 2 f.
[86] *Tox.* 44 ff.
[87] *Navig.* 38; cf. *Icar.* 18, *Katapl.* 21.
[88] In an equally synthetic tale, *supra* 19.
[89] *Sat.* 140.7.
[90] Ovid. *Met.* I.607 ff.

compares him with another lover: Lucian naturally uses the topos in *D. Meretr.*,[91] and there is even some similarity in the actual dialogue.[92] The bawd's tale concerns the deception of one Barbarus, who entrusts his wife to his servant Myrmex, under threat of death. This is similar to the situation at the opening of Lucian's tale of Stratonice and Kombabos.[93] Myrmex is bribed and lets in the lover; the husband returns to find tell-tale slippers under the bed; but the lover then meets Myrmex and his master, and accuses the former of stealing them at the baths. There are two 'Lucianic' touches here: as in the story of Kombabos the servant is saved at the last moment by a brilliant ruse; [94] and Lucian also uses the motif of the slipper under the bed.[95]

After the bawd's tale, the baker surprises his wife's lover, who hides in a bin (IX.22-31); the ass then stamps on the lover's fingers so that he is discovered. So far a clear amalgam of the lover in the tub and the ass's betrayal of the priests.[96] The husband then promises to share the wife with the lover, but rapes him instead. The first motif is that of Antiochus and Stratonice (the generous husband allows himself to be cuckolded); Lucian reverses the second one: in *Alexander* a man raped by the husband seduces the wife.[97] But Apuleius' adulteress now goes to a witch, to get her husband back or have him killed. Lucian again uses this motif in reverse at *Philops.* 14, where the lover goes to the *magus* to get back someone else's insatiable wife.[98] The husband now reveals the whole affair to the daughter in a dream: again *revenants* are a recurrent feature of *Philopseudes*.[99]

The tale of the stepmother and the physician in X.2-12 is a similar improvisation from loose ends. The stepmother is in love with her stepson, again in the manner of Stratonice.[100] He takes his tutor's advice, as in *Philops.* 14; and the stepmother poisons her own son by mistake; Lucian has a similar mistaken poisoning

[91] IX.16.1 ff./*D. Meretr.* 7.
[92] IX.17.1 f./*D. Meretr.* 11.2.
[93] IX.17.3 ff./*DS* 19.
[94] IX.21.6/*DS* 25 f.
[95] *Ibid.*/*Philops.* 27 (under a chest); *Merc. Cond.* 17 (under the bed).
[96] IX.4-7, VIII.29.
[97] IX.27.4 ff./*Dea Syria* 18; *Alex.* 50.
[98] IX.29.4/*Philops.* 14.
[99] IX.31.1/*Philops.* 25.
[100] X.2.3 ff./*Dea Syria* 17 f. (So too Erbse, *o.c.* 113 ff.; but he regards the tale as being in general circulation).

in *D. Mort.*[101] She now blames the innocent stepson, another mythical borrowing, this time of the Hippolytus theme. There is an eleventh-hour intervention by the physician, who reveals all: once more Lucian is fond of introducing third parties in this way for his dénouements.[102]

The tale of the woman who is to sleep with the ass (X.23 ff.) is simply a rhetorical chain murder: the wanton wife poisons the chemist, the husband, the chemist's wife, and the daughter and heir to cover up her original crime of poisoning her husband's sister. Again Lucian does not shrink from fantastic and mechanical sequences of this kind.[103]

## J. POSSIBILITIES

It is very obvious that the 'Lucianic' content of the tales tends to fall off sharply after the robbers' tales, and it might be argued that the lover in the tub, for example, belongs to a milieu which Lucian tends to avoid: it is just not literary enough to be legitimate. But this would be true of the galli in the original as well, yet both are acceptable in the context of a fable-collection. The second half of the 'Apuleian' material is also less resourceful than the first: the author is increasingly prone to duplication and banality, as if he is running out of material. But not all of this need be due to Apuleius: the two halves of *Toxaris* are scarcely of equal interest, and Lucian's Greek tales are certainly not free from banality and repetition either. And Lucian is also guilty of over-stretching his material, as readers of *Fugitivi* or *Saturnalia* know only too well.

The parallels have wider implications. How did the tales arrive at the form in which Apuleius presents them? There are a number of possibilities:

(a) Apuleius found tales in a handbook or handbooks, and set about contaminating them. This is still a fair guess. He did not exert himself unduly in the frame tale: it would not be surprising if he proved to be a similar opportunist in his insertions.

(b) Apuleius could simply have contaminated the material directly from magic and rhetorical motifs. It is possible to conjecture from the parallels in Lucian that the raw material was well enough embedded in the second century sophists' repertoire. (Of

---

[101] X.4.3/*Philops.* 14; X.5.1 f./*D. Mort.* 7.
[102] *Eun.* 10; *D. Mort.* 12. 7.
[103] X.23.3 ff./*Icar.* 15; *Gall.* 25.

course this does not exclude the possibility that he added 'local' touches, for example in the *Risus*-festival).

(c) But it is difficult to ignore two other possibilities: is it coincidence that in a field where exact parallels are surprisingly hard to come by, so many hints turn up in Lucian, especially in *Toxaris, Philopseudes* and *de Dea Syria*, and so few in other sophistic writers? I have already developed the theory that Lucian had a hand in the original anyway. Did Apuleius find the tales by reading some of the rest of Lucian, or by exploiting a single lost work and contaminating it with the frame of the *Onos*? Or were those tales already in the original, in a less elaborate form?

The first of these is the least likely of all—reading the whole of Lucian takes time, and we have no idea how quickly his work was diffused. The second is attractive enough, but of course impossible to prove; Lucian could easily have attempted to conflate motifs from *Philopseudes* and *Toxaris* into a work similar in scope to the extant *Onos, de Dea Syria*, or *Verae Historiae*, which then served as a companion to the *Onos* and fell into the hands of Apuleius. But the last possibility is simpler: Apuleius takes over a great many insertions already embedded in the original version; and he exercises his capacity for embellishment on these just as vigorously as he did on the frame-narrative itself.

Further than this we cannot expect to go; we simply do not have enough information on the diffusion of narrative motifs in sophistic literature; nor can we estimate the repertoire available, for example, to a sophist such as Adrian of Tyre, who also wrote a *Metamorphoses*. Moreover any combination of the solutions suggested is possible. Apuleius could easily have adapted one tale from a Lucianic original, combined two others, lifted a fourth direct from a common source, and added Charite and *Cupid and Psyche* as well. There is no denying his literary individuality in the manner of telling *anything*, however he obtained the material. But we still need to be reminded how much he borrowed without the slightest effort when he annexed the frame: we cannot assume that such a flagrant *furtum* obliged him to look somewhere else for the rest—if he could get it from the same source. I can only hope to have shown that Lucian has *some* hand in the tales: we have to live with the uncomfortable suspicion that we are dealing with not one *desultor litterarum* but two; but one is still more predictable than the other.

## CHAPTER FIVE

# *DE DEA SYRIA*

The *de Dea Syria* can claim to be at least as bizarre as the *Onos*: a description of the shrine and rites of the Syrian goddess Atargatis at Hierapolis. In form it is presented as an 'extract' from history or ethnography; and in sophistic terminology, it is an *ecphrasis* as well. The many specialists who have been drawn to it for information on dialect, archaeology, or cult history seldom make detailed enquiries about the author; [1] and before we can relate it to Lucian's contributions to fiction, we have to deal with three separate issues: does the writer imitate Herodotus? Is he Lucian? And did he write it merely as imitation, or as subtle parody? The first question has been conclusively answered several times over: the author does imitate Herodotus, for whatever reason; [2] but most scholars have answered the other two with vague pronouncements about whether or not Lucian could ever adopt his opponents' point of view; the question demands much more detailed treatment.

For Lucian to write so prolonged an account of a temple and its rites seems at first sight unlikely. He himself had no antiquarian interest in ritual; but he does devote a whole pamphlet to 'exposing' the cult founded by Alexander of Abonoteichos. And he wrote several works where he seems to concentrate on imitating one of his 'authors' exhaustively—Plato in *Hermotimus*, Aristophanes in *Timon*, Menippus(?) in *D. Mort.*; while in *Historia* he gives pride of place to Thucydides. There is still a gap for Lucian's 'tribute' to

---

[1] Most of them have in fact accepted it, but with little or no discussion, e.g. F. G. Allinson, *Pseudo-Ionism in the second century*, *AJPh* 7 (1886), 203-207; H. Strong and J. Garstang, *The Syrian Goddess*, London 1913; H. Stocks, *Studien zu Lukians De Syria Dea*, *Berytus, Archaeological Studies published by the Museum of Archaeology of the American University of Beirut* 4, Copenhagen 1937, 1-40; C. Clemen, *Lukians Schrift über die Syrische Göttin übersetzt und erläutert*, *Der Alte Orient* 37, heft 3/4, Leipzig 1938. The last two, with Harmon's well annotated Loeb (IV.337 ff.), are an essential guide to the realistic features in this extremely recondite work.

[2] For the linguistic parallels see D. A. Penick, *Notes on Lucian's Syrian Goddess*, *Studies in honour of B. L. Gildersleeve*, Baltimore 1902, 387-93; O. Wedermeyer, *Der Pseudo-ionismus der Kaiserzeit und die Dea Syria*, Diss. Rostock 1923.

Herodotus. Now elsewhere he imitated the episode of Cyrus and the Massagetae; [3] Herodotus' previous section is a digression on Babylon, which includes a description of the temple of Zeus Belus and ritual prostitution.[4] Lucian had both the material and the incentive.

### A. THE 'LUCIANIC' THEMES

The *DS* has not been fully examined for contacts with the rest of the Lucianic Corpus: Helm rejected it on *a priori* grounds,[5] so that he neither gives it an appendix in *LM*, nor lists any cross-references in *PW*. But it has important points of contact with Lucian's attacks on pretenders. The city has its name changed to Hierapolis to commemorate the growth of the cult; Lucian took offence that Abonoteichos was renamed Ionopolis because of Alexander.[6] A papyrus head floating downstream is claimed to be the head of Osiris; the key point in Alexander's deception is the linen head he makes for Glycon.[7] And both oracles use autophones, which are meticulously described.[8] Once more *Philopseudes* is a natural source of cross-references. In both works a youth's adulterous passion serves as the starting-point for a tale.[9] Kombabos' statue is shaped like a woman, but dressed as a man; Eucrates has too much regard for a comical and unmanly statue of Pellichus.[10] In both pieces bronze is used to frighten spirits;[11] the god makes a solo flight, like the Hyperborean wizard; [12] and statues go on the move: Zeus and Hera move down towards the lake, while Pellichus walks round Eucrates' house.[13]

The fantastic voyages in *Icar.* and *VH* supply still more parallels. The author describes the exotic city of Hierapolis; Lucian includes several such episodes in *VH*, and describes a temple on his island of Dreams.[14] Both authors rationalise a natural phenomenon in a

---

[3] Herod. I.201 ff./*Charon* 13.

[4] I.178 ff.

[5] *PW* 1761.

[6] *DS* 1/*Alex.* 58.

[7] *DS* 7/*Alex.* 12.

[8] *DS* 36/*Alex.* 26.

[9] *DS* 17 f./*Philops.* 14 f.

[10] *DS* 26/*Philops.* 18. For Lucian's interest in androgynes, cf. *VH* I.22.

[11] *DS* 29/*Philops.* 15. (In *DS* the purpose is left unstated).

[12] *DS* 37/*Philops.* 13.

[13] *DS* 47/*Philops.* 19. Bompaire (648) adds *DS* 36 (Apollo's moving statue)/ *Philops.*

[14] *DS* 1/*VH* I.29; II.32 ff.

ridiculous manner: in *DS* a blood-red river is explained after Herodotus, while Lucian explains a blood-red sunset in terms of Homer.[15] Both report some new refinements in unnatural love—women and galli at Hierapolis, men and their wives-cum-husbands on the moon, or general promiscuity on the Islands of the Blest.[16] They are also interested in fantastic measurements;[17] describe eccentric uses for a phallus (as a ladder or a ship's mast!);[18] and note lingering odours[19] and exotic fish.[20] In fact the goldfish at Hierapolis are widely authenticated (as is the tradition that they answer to a summons);[21] but Lucian was also interested in this sort of subject: Parrhesiades is able to summon a philosopher-goldfish at *Pisc.* 51. Both authors also rationalise fantastic floating objects: a floating altar in the middle of the lake is supported by a submerged pillar; and an island in *VH* turns out to be a giant nest.[22] The priests at Hierapolis hang their sacrifices on trees: Lucian will describe any ridiculous objects dangling from above, and even invents sailors hanging ἐκ τῶν αἰδοίων from vines.[23] And both authors introduce several 'autobiographical' touches to provide corroborative detail.[24] Some of the details in *Icar.* are equally close: Stratonice's amorous intrigues appear in both works.[25] Or a comic device makes prayers more accessible—the priests have a pillar for climbing nearer heaven, while Zeus has a 'listening device' to pick up the prayers.[26] Both writers turn their gods into water-carriers,[27] and deep water is a source of fun: the lake has an absurd depth not bourne out by archaeology, while Lucian's philosophers waste their time plumbing the depths of the sea.[28]

A number of other features in *DS* are *bêtes noires* of Lucian. The sketch of religious history is similar to the bogus history of phi-

---

[15] *DS* 8 (see *infra* 74)/*VH* I.17 (*Il.* XVI.459).
[16] *DS* 22/*VH* I.22; II.19.
[17] *DS* 28/*VH passim.*
[18] *DS* 28/*VH* II.45.
[19] *DS* 30/*VH* II.5, cf. ***Fugit.*** 1.
[20] *DS* 45/*VH* I.7.
[21] Clemen *o.c.* 48.
[22] *DS* 46/*VH* II.40.
[23] *DS* 49/*VH* I.8; for others, see ***Theme and Variation*** 30, 36.
[24] *DS* 60/*VH* I.26, 29; II.28, 34.
[25] *DS* 17/*Icar.* 15.
[26] *DS* 28/*Icar.* 25.
[27] *DS* 33/*Icar.* 7.
[28] *DS* 46 (Clemen, *o.c.* 47)/*Icar.* 6, cf. ***Vit. Auct.*** 26.

losophy in *Fugitivi*;[29] and Deucalion the Scythian establishes a temple, while the foolish Scythians in *Toxaris* have their own Oresteium.[30] The author of *DS* describes the exaggerated mourning for Adonis, while Lucian laughs at the rites for Phaethon,[31] and has a tomb for the chief of the gods.[32] Both notice the enormous wealth of temples,[33] their ritual prohibitions, [34] and their extravagant ornaments.[35] There is a hint of syncretism in the likeness of Hera: Lucian is not slow to ridicule gods who take on too many functions, and his portrait of Ogmios combines Hermes and Heracles;[36] the curious σημήιον is reminiscent of Lucian's satire of the gods ἐκ διαφωνίας,[37] and both authors make the joke about Apollo's beard and describe ritual mutilation and animal sacrifice.[38] Even the alleged oversights in *DS* turn out to be of a 'Lucianic' type.[39] Some of the parallel passages cited could have arisen independently when two authors set out to imitate Herodotus; some others concern real objects which were there to be described.[40]

---

[29] *DS* 2/*Fugit.* 6 ff.

[30] *DS* 12/*Tox.* 5 ff. Buttmann's conjecture Σισύθεα probably does not represent what the author wrote. Whoever he was, it is clear that he would not lose the opportunity to allude to a nation which figures so prominently in Herodotus.

[31] *DS* 6/*Electr.* 2 f.; *D. Deor.* 25.2.

[32] *DS* 7/*Deor. Conc.* 6, *J. Trag.* 45.

[33] *DS* 10/*Phal.* II.8, *Alex.* 23.

[34] *DS* 14/*Gall.* 18.

[35] *DS* 30/*Charon* 11; *ibid.*/*de Domo* 8.

[36] *DS* 32, cf. *Deor. Conc.* 16; *Katapl.* 1. For Ogmios, *Her.* 4. Caster protested (*Pensée, ibid.*) that Lucian had no interest in syncretism. But again it is so characteristic of Herodotus that any parodist is entitled to make use of it (Herod. I.199; II.42; II.112, 137 f., etc.).

[37] *DS* 33/*Icar.* 9, *J. Trag.* 42.

[38] *DS* 35/*J. Trag.* 26; 50/*Luct.* 12 f.; 54/*Sacr.* 13.

[39] L. Hermann (*AC* 35, 1966, 446) drew attention to two inconsistencies which he takes to be incompatible with Lucian's authorship: both are in fact fully characteristic. His allusions to Stratonice are not always consistent (*DS* 17 ff., *Hist.* 35, *Calumnia* 14): he is notoriously inaccurate about historical details, especially Hellenistic court intrigues; and in the case of *Hist.* 35 he presents two alternative versions only to keep up the façade of erudition appropriate to his 'treatise' on historiography. Secondly, at *DS* 15 the goddess has a tambourine in one hand; in 32 she has a sceptre in one hand, a spindle in the other. Why not, since the second image is exceptionally syncretistic anyway? But Lucian likes to load statues with as much paraphernalia as possible, so that even the Zeus of Olympia is given the wrong emblems (*Timon* 4)!

[40] E.g. *DS* 46/Herod. II. 149 (Lake Moeris); *ibid.*, the floating altar, cf. Herod. II.155 f.; lingering odours, 30/Herod. III. 113 (Hall, *Lucian's Satire*

But as a whole these parallels show how much scope the theme would have given to Lucian—to transplant favourite themes into an exotic jargon, as he did with such panache in *Lexiphanes*.[41]

B. 'LUCIANIC' HUMOUR?

Is the *DS* burlesque, however, or would Lucian have been content to present his material merely as a neutral pastiche of Herodotus? Most scholars have taken to either of two extreme positions: for Croiset Lucian's purpose here, as in *VH*, is 'rendre vraisemblables, par un air de sincérité, des choses qu'on tire de son imagination en les mêlant à quelques détails exacts'; while Caster asserted with equal fervour that Lucian could not be allowed to say the opposite of what he meant.[42] Bompaire[43] accepts that the author's intentions are humorous by comparing the work to *Lexiphanes, de Parasito*, and *Muscae Encomium*. But there is no real parallel here: the last two belong quite obviously to the realm of *adoxa*; while in *Lex.* the burlesque stops halfway through and 'Lycinus' speaks in his own person. The *DS* belongs to neither category.

Helm and Caster on the other hand adopt too narrow a view of Lucian's satire: the former expects Lucian to produce only explicit parody in the style of *Verae Historiae*.[44] On the contrary, when there is so much material common to *VH* and *DS*, Lucian would have been all the more likely to look for a different way of presenting it; and by Helm's argument we should be forced to exclude *Toxaris* from the *Corpus* because its variety of burlesque is quite different from that of *VH*, and its humour less concentrated. Caster could not allow an author with Lucian's views to pass over the curious pretence of child sacrifice at *DS* 58 'avec impassibilité'.[45] But Lucian can condemn Scythians eating their dead at *Luct.* 21 in strongly Cynic terms, and still dismiss the subject in a totally different way at *Tox.* 9, where an urbane Scythian politely postpones the subject without further comment. And he describes the

277). For Lucian's own borrowings from Herodotus, see Penick, *Herodotus in the Greek Renascence*, Baltimore 1902, 35 ff. Since there actually *were* goldfish in the pond at Hierapolis, it is perhaps superfluous to suggest that the author mentions them in imitation of the jewelled crocodile at Herod. II.69 (Hall 277). But the coincidence was certainly convenient.

[41] See *Theme and Variation* 129 f.

[42] *Essai sur la vie et les oeuvres de Lucien*, Paris 1882, 63; Caster, *Pensée* 363.

[43] 647.

[44] *PW* 1761.

[45] *Pensée* 362.

Selenites inhaling smoke for nourishment 'avec impassibilité' at *VH* I.23, but condemns the gods outright for the same practice at *Sacr.* 9. He also proves elsewhere that he has a wide range of different types of humour at his command: each of the 'suites' of miniature dialogues has a different nuance, and in particular the *D. Mar.* and some of the *D. Deor.* depend on his ability to restrain his usual criticisms in the face of some quite absurd situation. Philostratus confirms that the ὑπόθεσις ἐσχηματισμένη was considered difficult and carried corresponding prestige.[46] He implies that such an exercise would have to be a consistent presentation of an alien viewpoint all the way through: but Helm rightly points out that the parodist would still have a duty to see that the audience could recognise his irony. He would not, however, be obliged to do so within the work itself: if Lucian presented the *DS* in front of a regular public, anyone familiar with the *D. Deor.* or the 'Menippean' pieces would appreciate its irony from the mouth of an outspoken sceptic. If, on the other hand, he had to deliver it to a strange audience, then it would still need only a brief *prolalia* to make his intentions clear. The introductions to *Historia* or *VH* would be suitable almost as they stand, especially the latter with its declaration that the author is about to embark on a series of falsehoods (4),[47] and elsewhere he introduces Herodotus sarcastically to his audience to deliver a few words in Ionic (*de Domo* 20); he could equally well have brought him on in an introduction to deliver the whole piece. In *Philops.* 2-4 he affects to excuse historians who tell lies for gain, or whole peoples and countries who use lying to make their sites better tourist attractions. A description of Hierapolis by Herodotus would have been an ideal example of both. Among the extant *prolaliae,* Sinko [48] suggested *Herodotus sive Aetion,* but only because the *DS* is in Ionic. This link deserves closer attention: *Herod.* is addressed to a Macedonian audience, who might welcome an exotic account of his local *mirabilia* from a Syrian. Moreover Lucian compares himself to Herodotus (7); and he is apparently addressing an audience of local litterati (8) whom he contrasts with the motley crowd, most of whom have no time for the historian:

---

[46] *VS* 542; some even found that Polemo could not sustain them; cf. Spengel III.235 f.; Bompaire 591.

[47] *Hist.* 1-5, *VH* 1-4.

[48] *Symbolae Chronologicae, o.c.* 41; so Hall, *Lucian's Satire* 280.

these would be the best equipped to savour a recherché parody of this kind.

Others however see *DS* as straightforward imitation of Herodotus, with no attempt at parody: Hall argues that 'it does not seem sufficiently exaggerated: whether one finds the piece funny or not depends on whether one considers the Herodotean blend of scepticism and credulity funny'.[49] But the fun lies in making the mild sceptic and credulous traveller into the mouthpiece of the satirist: can Lucian convey his usual criticisms to the reader when limited to the style of the credulous historian? Hall takes her example, like Caster, from *DS* 8: [50] the narrator is explaining the cause of a blood-red river, notes a scientific explanation, but then sets it aside in favour of Providence in view of the miraculous timing. Of course this is legitimate imitation of Herodotus' manner, but it does not mean that the writer himself approves of Providence, or that he identifies himself with Herodotus. Lucian gives a similar argument on behalf of Providence to the foolish Stoic Timocles (*J. Trag.* 38); and he allows the intelligentsia to reject normal laws of nature in favour of miraculous cures (*Philops.* 7 ff.). He also offers his own absurd explanation of blood-red sunsets after the sky-battle in *VH* I.17, without any indication in the context of his usual view. The situation at *DS* 8 would give him an opportunity to combine these three strands to coincide with imitation of Herodotus. To Lucian himself, or anyone who knew his work, this technique would be both amusing and characteristic. *DS* 16 is a similar case, which commentators explain according to their presuppositions on the work as a whole. The author is describing an inscription of Dionysus on a wooden phallus: the god presents it to his stepmother Hera. This is simply unintelligible if it is read as straightforward description: it is not confirmed on archaeological grounds; [51] we should have to connect the god with a cult of Cybele,[52] or read it simply as another imitation of Herodotus' credulity.[53] But it makes sense immediately if seen in terms of Lucian's motifs: he uses both

---

[49] *O.c.* 278; Helm *PW* 1761; H. Engel, *Die Abhängigkeit der ps.-Lukians Schrift Dea Syria von Herodot in sprachlicher und stilistischer Hinsicht*, Diss. Rostock 1925 (but without discussion of content).

[50] Hall 275, Caster *Pensée* 361.

[51] Clemen, *o.c.* 37.

[52] H. Stocks, *Berytus, Archaeological Studies published by the Museum of Archaeology of the American University of Beirut* 4 (1937), 10.

[53] Hall, *Lucian's Satire* 276.

components separately in *VH* (a wooden phallus, I.22; a bogus inscription by Dionysus, I.7, cf. Lucian's own inscription, II.28: this is one of his specialities).[54] Moreover Lucian's Hera is horrified by even the slightest indecency; in his eyes she would be the last person to have a phallus dedicated to her by Dionysus, whom she regards as an effeminate bastard.[55]

There are plenty of similar cases throughout *DS*: the writer frequently seems to make a statement and then qualify it with a reaction characteristic of Lucian: or he offers a description which in Lucian's eyes would have been too ridiculous to require further comment. It is the cumulative effect of these passages which will show how far the whole work can be read as parody:

*DS* 1: The writer has seen some things for himself, and heard others from priests. This is the most obvious material for any imitator of Herodotus, but it coincides with two of Lucian's favourite clichés: most of his rogues or dupes claim to be eyewitnesses,[56] and the Egyptian priests train several of Lucian's quacks (Peregrinus, *Peregr.* 17; Eucrates, *Philops.* 34; Pythagoras, *Gall.* 18).

3: There seem to be two different forms of Heracles, a Greek and a Tyrian, and their ages do not correspond. Lucian pokes fun at two forms of the Greek Heracles (*D. Mort.* 16); and he has fun elsewhere with heroic chronology (*Gall.* 17): Helen is herself a contemporary of Heracles, and so has aged somewhat by the time she comes to Troy!

4: The Phoenicians do not agree among themselves about whether the temple of Sidon is in honour of Europa. By implication they seem to feel that her legend is not quite proper and hesitate to attach it to the shrine. There are several strands here: the author strengthens his link with Herodotus, whose first book all but opens with a rationalised version of the rape (I.2). It is characteristic of Lucian to 'correct' his model in this way;[57] and he handles the abduction of Europa at *D. Mar.* 15 in an equally subtle way, without stating the satirical implications.

5: The witness admits that he did not see a particular ἱρόν (another temple? or cult-image?), but still insists that it was great

[54] Clemen, *ibid.*; Harmon, *ad loc.* See also *Theme and Variation* 34.
[55] *D. Deor.* 6; *D. Deor.* 18.1.
[56] See *Theme and Variation* 210 *s.v.* 'Pretended eyewitness'.
[57] *Theme and Variation* 25.

and old. Lucian makes fun of dupes taken in by relics, [58] and men who are prepared to swear blind to what they have not seen.[59] Harmon *ad loc.* suggested that the author has in mind a temple which 'moved' from Heliopolis to Phoenicia; certainly Lucian makes fun of writers who blithely transport whole sites (*Hist.* 24).

6: The author reserves his remarks on ritual prostitution to the end of his account of the temple at Byblos. There is a similar anti-climax at *Philops.* 15, where the elaborate rites for summoning Hecate turn out to be a cover for a student's affair with a courtesan.

8: The blood-red river.[60]

9: Cinyras founds a temple of Aphrodite. The name has erotic associations for Lucian: in *VH* II.25 he is Helen's latest lover.

10: The Syrians have secret treasure, and the greatest number of festivals. Lucian makes fun of the commercial aspects of Delphi, *Phalaris* II.8 (again as an ἐσχηματισμένη).

11: The author is going to recite myths he does not believe: cf. the advice Lucian gives to historians, *Hist.* 60.

13: He emphasises how small the hole is which was supposed to take all the floodwater, and does not rule out the possibility that it may have shrunk! Such a hole below the foundations of a temple plays a key role in Alexander's deceptions, *Alex.* 13; and Lucian finds equally fantastic functions for small holes in *Icar.* 25 f., where all the prayers and sacrifices have to find their way through well-mouths in heaven!

14: An obvious *non sequitur*: the author argues that *because* some Egyptians forbid the eating of fish, but not out of reverence for Derceto, *therefore* the Syrian prohibition on eating fish cannot be in honour of Derceto either!

27: An incredible explanation for the priests' effeminate dress—to prevent women from falling in love with eunuchs!

28: The author refuses to give reasons for the placing of a wooden man on top of a phallic pillar—which of course would have been sheer idiocy in Lucian's eyes.[61] Two passages of Herodotus have evidently been conflated here: H. declines to give reasons for a phallic procession, II.48, 52: and he describes pyramids rising 300

---

[58] *Adv. Ind.* 12 ff.; *Pseudolog.* 30.
[59] *Philops.* 24, *Hist.* 29.
[60] See *supra* 74.
[61] For his inventiveness in this sphere, cf. *Theme and Variation* 28, 33 ff.

feet out of Lake Moeris, each surmounted by a stone image of a man on a throne (II.149).

29: A ridiculous rationalisation for the pillar-climber's staying awake—he might fall down! Lucian ridicules an equally absurd topic with this kind of banal reasoning at *Philops.* 7—lions' skins are better cures for gout than hinds' skins *because* lions are swifter than hinds!

In the expression φαλλοβατέων μὲν δὴ περὶ τοσάδε ἀρκέει the author has applied a Herodotean formula of transition to a ridiculous subject. This can scarcely be less than burlesque: Lucian makes fun of another transitional formula at *Historia* 31, and criticises those who apply hallowed phrases from the historians to trivial objects (*Historia* 18, 22).

32: Hera's idol is cross-eyed. At *Bis Acc.* 2 Zeus complains that his eyes are always straining in different directions.

36: Apollo goes into a ludicrous trance before delivering his prophecy. Lucian gives the god a similar display in *J. Trag.* 30 f.[62]

39: Semiramis hands over power to Hera. Lucian has an interest in two aspects of this: he presents a bitter quarrel between Hera and a rival (Leto) in *D. Deor.* 16; and makes fun of Cronos' abdication of power to Zeus in *Sat.* 7.

40: Images of Alexander and Sardanapallus are placed side by side. Lucian makes a juxtaposition of this kind at *Philops.* 18, where the drole Pellichus is placed beside the 'Old Masters'.[63]

40: Bompaire (648 n. 1) notes that Tereus has changed into a bird while Philomela is still a woman: this is comparable to Lucian's joke in *D. Mar.* 7.2, where Hermes changes into a doghead the moment Io has resumed her shape as a woman.

43: The galli have an entourage of mad women. Lucian develops the comic possibilities of Dionysus and his crew at *Bacch.* 1 ff., *D. Deor.* 18.1.

47: Hera will not allow Zeus to see the fish in the Lake: Lucian exploits their domestic quarrels, *D. Deor.* 5, 18, cf. *J. Trag.* 1 f.; and makes fun of religious taboos, *Gall.* 18, *Alex.* 41, *VH* II.28.

48: A cock opens seals and is handsomely rewarded: this may allude to a real animal, or to some priestly function which the

---

[62] Cf. also Bompaire 648; Caster's objection to a humorous interpretation is groundless (*Pensée* 361).

[63] Cf. *Theme and Variation* 119.

author has misunderstood or misrepresented.[64] But there is no doubt about Lucian's own interest in the subject: at *Gall.* 18 the cock reincarnated from Pythagoras has made a fortune out of the superstitious; Lucian himself was scandalised at the fortune which Alexander made from his industry of unsealing responses at Abonoteichus (*Alex.* 19-23); while in *VH* II.32 the cock itself is a god with its own sanctuary—by the waterside (33) as here. The cock unseals the waterpot which each pilgrim has to bring to the temple: Lucian finds water-carrying an endless source of humour (the sorcerer's πάρεδρος, *Philops.* 36; the Danaids, *D. Mar.* 6.3 cf. *Timon* 18; Libyan women trying to quench the heat of a snakebite, *Dips.* 6).

In most of these cases, then, the author has described a genuine religious phenomenon or a cliché from Herodotus which coincides with some *bête noire* of Lucian's; many of them stand at the end of paragraphs, so as to 'undo' whatever has gone before. It is difficult to see how a faithful devotee or neutral witness could have produced so many of these subtle coincidences in a row. Strong and Garstang[65] considered the piece worthy of a periegete and antiquarian, 'the work of an intelligent traveller ... anxious to record the facts that he has been able to ascertain ... but he confesses himself unable to explain all the miracles which he witnessed.' But an intelligent traveller could have been more explicit on matters which puzzled him; he might still have written in Ionic as a (fashionable) gesture of piety to Herodotus, and even copied his turns of phrase; but he could scarcely have pieced together two quite separate incidents in H. to describe what he could not possibly have seen.

### C. THE STORY OF KOMBABOS (19-26)

Few would criticise any of the passages so far discussed as 'un-Lucianic'; but the opponents of his authorship have claimed that long stretches of *DS* have no satirical relief whatever: Helm dismissed the 'lange und durchaus ernst gehaltene' story of Kombabos as showing 'von Lukianischem Geiste nicht die geringste

---

[64] Clemen, *o.c.* 51; H. Gressman, *Festschr. f. K. Marti*, *ZAW Beihefte* 41 (1925), 91. Cf. Alciphron's account (fgt. 98 Hercher) of the clever cock who took his place in a chorus in their celebrations in honour of Asclepius. *Contra*, Dussaud *PW* Hadad col. 2160, 55 f.; *Ph* 84 (1929), 377 ff. This would not of course exclude the author of *DS* from treating a priest with such a title as a joke, as Bompaire seems to imply (648 n. 1).

[65] *O.c.* 33, cf. Sinko, *Symbolae Chronologicae*, *o.c.* 41.

Spur';[66] Ganschinietz[67] and Harmon accept it as a genuine temple-legend. Kombabos escapes Stratonice's passion by castrating himself and depositing the evidence in a box in her husband's safekeeping. When accused by enemies at court, he saves himself by calling for his proof at the eleventh hour. He is rewarded for his fidelity, while his enemies are punished; and this is the reason for the galli's castration-rite.

It is not very easy to get a genuine oriental legend out of all this.[68] Herodotus is however more fruitful: Penick noticed that the recognition scene here (25 f.) is similar to Zopyrus' meeting with Darius (Herod. III.154). Z. only mutilates his face in the king's service: by comparison Kombabos' self-castration reads like a gross burlesque. In addition, Herodotus' story of Gyges[69] will supply us with the missing half of Kombabos' adventure: in both cases the foolish king persuades his faithful but reluctant servant to perform a task which will expose him to the queen's privacy (Herod. I.8/*DS* 19 ff.). Thus far any skilled parodist of Herodotus: but Lucian has a special interest in Stratonice,[70] and we should have expected him to find an opportunity for a full account of her affair with Antiochus (17 f.); and she would certainly be Lucian's most likely candidate for the villain of the Kombabos story. Some of the material is also reminiscent of Lucian's *Toxaris*: Stratonice's king sacrifices his wife for the sake of his son (*DS* 18); Abauchas makes the same sacrifice for his friend (*Tox.* 61). (Both variants are however based on Intaphernes' wife's reply to Darius at Herod. III.119, and could therefore be independent imitations). Again, Kombabos mutilates himself for his friend the king (*DS* 25), while Dandamis gives his eyes for his friend (*Tox.* 40); and Lucian is always interested in adulterous intrigue (*Tox.* 17) and slander in

---

[66] *PW* 1761.

[67] *PW Kombabos* XI, 1922, 1132-1139.

[68] As does V. Vikentiev, *Bulletin of the Faculty of Arts, University of Cairo*, 11 (1949), 100 f., who tries to connect Kombabos with the Humbaba of the Gilgamesh Epic. It is quite credible that Astarta-niku should be Hellenised as Stratonice, and that Humbaba himself underlies the name Kombabos: but the remaining facts are not so easy to fit. The seduced and reconciled Astarta-niku actually kills Humbaba, and Enkidu castrates not himself but a bull. Lucian's version reads like malicious improvisation on a small amount of 'given' material, as in *Toxaris*.

[69] Lucian quotes a tag from Candaules' commands at *de Domo* 20, *Historia* 29.

[70] *Icar.* 15; *pro Imag.* 5; *Historia* 35; *Calumnia* 14.

high places (*Calumnia passim*). Here the story hinges on the fact that Kombabos turns out to be a eunuch in effect (25) though an adulterer by repute; in the *Eunuchus* Lucian works out the reverse of this motif: Bagoas is an adulterer in fact but a eunuch by repute! Kombabos puts his genitals into a tiny vessel: the devotees of Cybele did in fact preserve their genitals in a *cista*,[71] and Clement of Alexandria (*ad Graecos* II.16P) makes fun of such a container when describing the dismemberment of Dionysus (i.e. Attis). This aspect of the matter was of some interest to Lucian: in *VH* I.22 the Selenites have genitals which are πρόσθετα, and their other essential organs can be hoarded and brought out again for use (25); here he would have had a chance to conflate these two motifs and make Kombabos 'deposit' his genitals. Now the king is keeping his friend's embalmed parts (*DS* 20): Aelian cites another curious case (*VH* XII.8), where the Spartan Cleomenes embalms his friend's head in a jar and makes it his right-hand man! Taken as a whole Kombabos' adventures read like a pot-pourri of the most bizarre situations from Achilles Tatius and Heliodorus:[72] grotesque mutilation, the ruler's wife's insatiable passion, a chastity test to end all chastity tests, an eleventh-hour rescue, and discovery from a casket. We have already seen that Lucian cannot be acquitted of 'manufacturing' his own 'folktales' and novellae: [73] in spite of Helm, it is clear that a bogus temple-legend patched together from elements of genuine cult-practice, highlights of Herodotus, and novellistic motifs would be perfectly consistent with Lucian's tastes and methods. The name Kombabos itself may reflect his usual techniques: he adopts a whimsical freedom with oriental names.[74] Ctesias mentions a powerful Egyptian eunuch Kombaphis,[75] and the inventor of Toxaris and Gyndanes could easily have arrived at the variant Kombabos by conflating it with the authentic Humbaba. Nor is it a surprise to find an otherwise unknown sculptor Hermocles of Rhodes (*DS* 27) responsible for Kombabos' statue: his name comprises two of Lucian's three favourite name-elements (Ἑρμο-, -τιμο-, -κλης): when he applies the names Hermotimus and

---

[71] A. D. Nock, *ARW* 23 (1923), 25.
[72] See *infra*, c. VI.
[73] *Supra*, c. II.
[74] See *supra*, c. II n. 20.
[75] Photius *Cod.* 72.37a.

Timocles to fictitious persons, and describes fictitious statues,[76] then Hermocles too deserves to be suspect.

D. THE ACCOUNT OF THE RITES (49-60)

The long concluding section contains fewer comic touches than the rest. Bompaire, otherwise in favour of Lucian's authorship, admits that 'on peut cependant admettre que l'auteur n'a pas mené à terme son dessein parodique et a bâclé sa fin'.[77] This is not however enough to disqualify Lucian from authorship: instead it serves to set the seal on the author's parody of Herodotus. The historian himself was capable of tedious descriptions of this kind, so that a list of Persian satrapies after III.89-96 or a mere topographical catalogue after IV.37-45 would still be competent imitation. Lucian himself is not exempt from charges of monotony, as when he parodies the historians' formulae for describing the order of battle (*VH* I.13 ff.) and succumbs to inventing scores of proper names. And he is also apt to be lengthy and tedious when writing against superstitions. If he discovered a new framework here for a whole range of his complaints, then it is no surprise if he exploits it at some length.[78] The author of *DS* is certainly interested in the same kind of detail as Lucian: he describes a rite (55) where the worshipper sits on the hide of the sacrificed animal, as in *Tox.* 48, and masquerades in a sheep's head, as Zeus does at *Sacr.* 14. One feature seems clearly burlesque: in *DS* 53 a runner, newly castrated, casts his genitals into a house on his way through the city: it is tempting to connect this with Herodotus' account of a bogus festival at Samos (III.48), where the dancers bring cakes of sesame and honey to the temple, so that the suppliants within can snatch them. The original purpose of this rite was to *save* the Corcyrean suppliants from castration. It would certainly not have been outside Lucian's scope to improvise a festival which combined the two elements of Herodotus' version into a travesty: and Lucian could be savagely inventive when writing on subjects of this kind.[79] But the greatest absurdities are reserved for the end: the Syrians practise a strange substitute for child-sacrifice (58) and cut off

[76] *Theme and Variation* 34.

[77] Bompaire 647.

[78] Torchlight ceremony, *DS* 49/*Alex.* 38; funeral customs, 52/*Luct. passim*; animal sacrifice, 54/*Sacr.* 12; ritual taboo, 54/*Gall.* 18.,

[79] Cf. *VH* I.8; *Pseudolog.* 27.

locks of hair (60). Similar rites are reserved for the climax of *Sacr.* (human sacrifice, 13; cutting of hair, 15); and the Syrians carry their children in pouches, like the Selenites at *VH* I.24. And in *Tox.* 61 Lucian reserves Gyndanes' sacrifice of his child for the last example of Scythian 'friendship'. A mock child-sacrifice is just the right kind of absurdity here.

The cumulative evidence in favour of Lucian's authorship is formidable. Like the *Onos* this is another ingenious redeployment of the techniques of *Philopseudes* and *Toxaris*. It is particularly useful to set it against *VH*: Lucian's comic fiction is not to be contained within one single literary form or idiom. It is worth noting that the nearest approach to this comic account of bizarre and exotic ritual is to be found in the Ideal Romance, in Achilles Tatius' description of an Egyptian (mock-)sacrifice,[80] and in the recently discovered fragments of Lollianus' *Phoinikika*:[81] it is time to examine Lucian's connexion with the novel as a genre.

[80] III.15.

[81] A. Henrichs, *Die Phoinikika des Lollianos, Fragmente eines neuen griechischen Romans*, Bonn 1972: H. interprets the description of rites as tasteless rather than ridiculous—unwisely in the light of Achilles' version?

## CHAPTER SIX

# POINTS OF CONTACT:

# IDEAL ROMANCE AND ITS FRINGES

So far we have studied Lucian's five contributions to fiction in terms of his own sources and techniques. We have still to examine how his work is related to the forms and repertoire of fiction available to Imperial authors, and here the whole range of his writings can be used as evidence. I have divided the material into two groups which happen to correspond to 'Ideal' and 'Comic' Romance. That was not my original criterion: this chapter shows how Lucian's fiction overlaps with literature that is known and available; the next explores his relationship with the unknown.

### A. LUCIAN AND THE IDEAL ROMANCE

Lucian's links with the contemporary novel have received little attention. Most *Quellenforscher* had already exhausted him before papyrus discoveries proved that some of the extant works are reasonably close in time to his own.[1] Helm interpreted several elements in his work as parodies of Ideal Romance;[2] but Bompaire has contended that he only knew those elements of it which he had absorbed through rhetorical tradition, and that he knew travel-romance (i.e. Antonius Diogenes) independently.[3] This leads him to remain rather hesitant about the *Onos*, and to relate it tentatively to *VH* rather than to the romances. In the same way Perry, while accepting Lucian as the author of the *Onos*, tries to dissociate the comic romances from the rest.[4] We can test these

---

[1] For general surveys of the literature on the Romance see now B. P. Reardon, *Courants littéraires grecs des IIe et IIIe siècles après J.-C.*, Paris 1971, 309-403 and notes; R. Helm, *Der antike Roman*, Berlin 1948 (Göttingen 1956); Q. Cataudella, *Il Romanzo Classico*, Rome 1958; G. Giangrande, *Eranos* 60 (1962), 132-159; Perry, *Ancient Romances* 379-85. The most recent work is briefly noted by G. N. Sandy, *CW* 67 (1974), 321-359. For a comprehensive summary of recent datings, see Reardon 334 f. and nn. 57-59; in particular Perry offers an attractive early dating for Charito.

[2] *Der antike Roman, o.c.* 65-68, cf. Rohde 55, 201 n. 3.

[3] 674 ff.

[4] *Ancient Romances* 87 ff.

relationships by examining the type of motif common to Lucian and the writers of Ideal Romance. None of these can be conclusively dated before Lucian, though Iamblichus was certainly a contemporary; but together they reflect the milieu clearly enough to give us reliable grounds for comparison.

Battle-scenes are a recurrent ingredient in both Lucian and the romancers: [5] the hero himself may be invited to take part in an engagement, and will describe the armaments in detail; [6] he can be general of a select band, commissioned to take on the Persians; [7] or he will bring back the rival king's head.[8] But rhetoricians are seldom content with conventional battles. The winning side can use some new weapon to cause panic in the enemy ranks—either elephants [9] or a god who turns his ludicrous orgy into a military rout.[10] Naturally there must be new kinds of sea battles as well,[11] including land battles on water,[12] and all sorts of nautical paraphernalia have to be worked in—miraculous islands,[13] some of them afloat,[14] *ecphrasis* of a storm, and of course hairbreadth escapes.[15] Lucian also shares the novelists' taste for paradoxography: he too has his fantastic animals,[16] including a grotesque creature which causes alarm when exhibited in public,[17] and wells with novel functions.[18] There is also a common repertoire of magic: invocations of Hecate,[19] contrasting pairs of oracles,[20] magic rings,[21] alarm at seeing ghosts,[22] or elaborate pseudo-magic: men disguised

---

[5] *VH* I.13-18/Achilles III.13; Heliodorus IX.16 ff.
[6] *VH* I.12-16/Achilles *ibid.*; Heliodorus IX.15.
[7] *Navig.* 28 ff./Charito VII.3.4.
[8] *Tox.* 50/Charito VII.5.14.
[9] *Zeuxis* 9 ff./Heliodorus IX.18.
[10] *Bacch.* 1-4 (Dionysus)/Longus II.26 (Pan).
[11] Achilles IV.13 cf. Heliodorus V.27/*J. Trag.* 47 f.
[12] *VH* I.37 ff./Achilles IV.14.
[13] *VH passim*/Heliodorus X.27.
[14] *VH* I.40/Achilles IV.13 f.
[15] *Merc. Cond.* 1 f./Achilles III.5.
[16] *VH passim*/Achilles IV.2 (hippopotamus).
[17] *Prom. es* 4 (black camel, two-coloured man)/Heliodorus X.27 f. (camel-leopard).
[18] *DS* 13 (a drain for the flood); *VH* I.26 (a telescope)/Heliodorus IX.22 (a gauge for measuring the Nile).
[19] *Philops.* 14, cf. 22, 24/Achilles III.18.
[20] *Peregr.* 29 f./Heliodorus VIII.11.
[21] *Philops.* 17, 24, 38; *Navig.* 42/Heliodorus VIII.11.
[22] *Philops.* 31 cf. 22/Xen. Ephes. V.7.8.

as ghosts,[23] or grotesque *trompes l'oeil* made from parts of animals.[24] Lucian also finds a place for many of the themes of adventure familiar in the novel—wrongful imprisonment,[25] complicated poisoning scenes,[26] lying tales,[27] and extraordinary scenes in court.[28] And there is a common store of erotic intrigues: apart from the inevitable lovers' vigil and gifts,[29] or symptoms of illness due to love,[30] we find the outraged husband assaulting the adulterer; [31] the suspicious lover mistaking a sleeping person's identity; [32] the ruler's wife's passion for a courtier; [33] the paramour seduced by a rich man posing as a teacher of rhetoric; [34] or the friend taking on his companion's burden when the latter is wasting away with love.[35] There are also some sexual themes in common—erotic postures,[36] seduction by a homosexual,[37] adultery aboard ship,[38] and even Odysseus and the Cyclops re-interpreted as a sexual episode.[39] The pastoral decoration used by Longus appears in a rather different cross-section of Lucian's repertoire: in both writers the young innocent thinks about love only in terms of the pastures; [40] and his only gods are rustic gods.[41] The competing lover can only offer humble presents; [42] Eros is a playful naughty boy; [43] and lovers have to fear a bully rather than an oriental courtier.[44]

What is conspicuously missing in all this is the one theme which unites the romances—the motif of the passionate young lovers

---

[23] *Philops.* 32/Iamblichus (ap. Phot. *Cod.* 74b).
[24] Alexander's god Glycon, *Alex.* 12, 15/Achilles III.21 (a grotesque *Scheintod* contrived from sheepgut).
[25] *Tox.* 28 ff./Heliodorus I.26.
[26] *Icar.* 15; *D. Mort.* 7/Iamblichus 74b.
[27] *Tox.* 49, 51/Heliodorus I.26.
[28] Achilles VII.7 ff., cf. *Tox.* 32 f.
[29] *Tox.* 15/Charito I.3.
[30] *Tox.* 15, *DS* 17/Charito IV.2.3.
[31] *Tox.* 17, cf. Achilles V.23, Heliodorus I.12.
[32] *D. Meretr.* 12.4/Heliodorus I.12.
[33] *DS* 22/Heliodorus VII.21.
[34] *D. Meretr.* 10.4/Xen. Ephes. III.2.8.
[35] *Tox.* 16 ff./Charito IV.2.3.
[36] *Onos* 9 f./Achilles II.37; Longus III.18.
[37] *D. Deor.* 4.4 f., cf. 23.2/Longus IV.11 f.
[38] *Peregr.* 43/Achilles VIII.10.9.
[39] *Pseudolog.* 27/Ach. II.23.
[40] Ganymede, *D. Deor.* 4; Paris, *Dear. Iud.* 7; Chloe, Longus I.14.
[41] *D. Deor.* 4./Longus II.39.
[42] *D. Meretr.* 14/Longus I.16, cf. I.19.
[43] *D. Deor.* 11, 12/Longus II.5.
[44] *D. Meretr.* 9, 15/Longus IV.7.

pursued, separated, and prevented from achieving their final consummation. Lucian knows all the situations which intervene to delay them—though he uses them only in quite different contexts; and of course he is familiar with all the rhetorical trappings. But his own interests in love are quite different: similes about lovers come direct from Plato; [45] but otherwise love affairs have no appeal unless they contain some element of scandal (usually bizarre). The only exception is Mazaea (*Tox.* 52), who is rescued melodramatically from her new and undeserving husband still a virgin,[46] against a background of 'romantic' motifs; but she is no more her other suitor's sweetheart than her husband's. But does this aversion to the key theme prove that Lucian did not know the romances? Some of the situations seem too closely parallel, and their cumulative evidence is very considerable: it seems more probable that the rhetorical material Lucian shares with the romances was already embedded in the novel tradition as well, and that Lucian found much of it conveniently collected in his reading of this literature.

One topos in particular seems to point in this direction. At *Onos* 26 the robbers are debating the heroine's fate: she is to be entombed inside the gutted ass so that both decay together. The two parts of this incident are both well represented in the Ideal Romance: the robbers discuss the heroine's fate in Charito, Xenophon and Heliodorus.[47] The theme of 'grotesque entombment' is even better illustrated: robbers gut the girl and bury her, as they suppose; the hero prays that one fish may be the tomb for himself and his heroine together; or the heroine's unborn child is entombed twice over at the same time, since her mother is buried alive in a tomb! [48] Iamblichus excels himself in this kind of absurdity: in two consecutive episodes of Photius' summary,[49] the king orders men to be buried alive with their women and children; and a dog is slaughtered after it has half-eaten the (supposed) heroine! And Xenophon comes very close to Lucian's version: the robbers decide whether to bury the heroine with the robber's corpse, or keep her in a trench with two mad dogs.[50] It is just possible chronologically that Xenophon took his episode directly from Lucian; but Charito, scarcely

[45] *Nigr.* 7/*Phaedr.* 255D.
[46] Cf. Longus IV.28 f.
[47] Charito I.10; Xen. Ephes. IV.6.1 ff.; Heliodorus I.19 ff.
[48] Achilles III.15; *ibid.* III.5; Charito II.8.7.
[49] Photius *Cod.* 94. 77a.
[50] IV.6.2 ff.

related to Lucian or the *Onos* at all, produces a comparably grotesque version.[51] Lucian might again have taken the situation directly from a *controversia* of the most absurd kind; but then it is unlikely that he should have been able to place it exactly where it belongs in the Ideal Romance—without having read any.[52] Given that the topos is from this source there should be no doubt that the *Onos* itself is a parody of it. Lucius also undergoes those same hairbreadth separations from his goal which provide the characteristic outline of the sentimental novel; and its topoi are inverted: we have gross sexuality instead of inviolable chastity, and the work ends with sexual rejection instead of consummation. Nor does the fact that Lucian generally avoids the ideal heroine prove that he had read no Ideal Romance. It does not prove that he had read no New Comedy or Antonius Diogenes:[53] both these sources he did know, and both contain the theme of lovers separated and sensationally united, which he ignores: one of the papyrus fragments of Antonius proves that he exhibited the same rhetorical sentimentality as the rest. It is simply that this particular theme did not interest Lucian: he shows no interest in Aristophanes' extensive treatment of women either; and he prefers scandal to sentimentality. He may also have regarded 'true-love' themes as a violation of 'classical' taste; even his panegyric of Panthea is introduced with an apology: Lycinus is expected to follow Platonic convention and prefer favourites (*Imag.* 1). In *Toxaris* he turns his back on conventional love and sets out to exalt male friendships instead. In an age of the *Halbphilosoph* and *Halbhistoriker*, Lucian has elected to be a *Halbromanschriftsteller*.

Direct contact with the extant romancers is a different matter. J. Schwartz[54] has recently attempted to establish precise verbal

---

[51] For the relationship of Xenophon and Charito, however, see now Reardon *o.c.* 336 n. 57; 337 n. 59.

[52] The scene in the *Onos* is of course a self-sufficient narrative as well as a parody; but there is no need to deny the latter (as Werner does, *H* 53, 1918, 261, against K. Bürger, *Der Lukiosroman und seine litteraturgeschichtliche Bedeutung*, Progr. Blankenburg 1902, 21 f.). The point is that this topos in the Ideal Romance is especially vulnerable; but it is so ridiculous even there that it is difficult to outdo the most serious romancer in absurdity.

[53] For the fragments of Antonius Diogenes, see F. Zimmerman *PhW* 55 (1935), 474-480; *H* 71 (1936) 312-319; Reyhl *o.c.* 11-14. For Lucian's use of New Comedy, see Ph. Legrand *REG* 20 (1907), 176-231; 21 (1908), 39-79; Bompaire 361-65; 569-71.

[54] *AC* 36 (1967), 536-549.

and thematic links between Achilles Tatius and Lucian: the former would have read some miniature dialogues and the *Pseudologist*, and could then be dated accordingly. But the parallels which Schwartz chooses to press are among the least promising between any Imperial writers. Achilles makes oblique reference to Zeus' disguises to seduce Ganymede, Europa, Antiope, and Danae: Lucian's Hera recriminates with Zeus about the same four episodes.[55] Both writers note that he goes down to visit the women and brings the boy up to heaven. But catalogues of this kind belong to the *progymnasmata*, as Bompaire [56] has exhaustively shown: ps.-Menander has the complete dossier. Schwartz himself provides other evidence elsewhere: [57] Lucian himself has no fewer than seven different catalogues containing permutations of Zeus' amours, and it would be difficult for Achilles not to be close to one of them; his particular list was in circulation as Christian propaganda as early as Aristides of Athens under Antoninus Pius.[58] A supplementary list in Achilles [59] contains Alcmene, Danae and Semele—available straight from Homer *Il.* XIII.311 ff. Moreover Petronius is already able to parody the practice of lovers moralising on the loves of Zeus (at least as a topos of the schools, but perhaps already in the novel as well).[60] Schwartz' other evidence rests on mere Hellenistic commonplaces: Achilles scarcely needs to read Lucian to find Eros leading Zeus the bull [61] or lovers kissing the cup.[62]

His second set of parallels is between Lucian's attack on the pseudologist and Achilles' handling of Thersander in the trial of Clitophon. Apart from the usual accusations, both writers hint that the victim has misused his tongue for sexual purposes: [63] but Lucian admits in *Rh. Pr.* 23 that this is an accusation which every rhetor needs, in order to establish his reputation in infamy—thereby indicating that this too is a commonplace. (Lucian summons the pseudologist's tongue as a witness: it is this striking εἰδωλοποιΐα

[55] Achilles II.37.2/*D. Deor.* 5.2.
[56] 198 ff.
[57] *Biographie de Lucien de Samosate*, Brussels 1965, 76.
[58] *Apol.* IX.
[59] II.36.4; 37.4.
[60] *Sat.* 83.3 ff.
[61] He could develop it straight from the Hellenistic commonplace that Zeus is the victim of Eros; or take his cue from the bull's retinue in Moschus II.
[62] *E.g.* Ovid *Am.* I.iv.32.
[63] *Pseudolog.* 25; Achilles VIII.10.4.

that Achilles does *not* echo). Secondly, Lucian summons a Menander prologue to give evidence; Achilles' priest of Artemis emulates Aristophanic Comedy.[64] But the two cases are not parallel: Lucian summons a surprise witness; the priest simply introduces a series of obscene puns in the manner of Aristophanes, and the content of his speech more than justifies this description in itself. At most both writers are developing independently the ubiquitous topos of the theatrical performer, which can be moulded to any circumstances.[65] There is no proven connexion, then, between Lucian and Achilles;[66] the chances of a link between Lucian and Heliodorus are still extremely remote for chronological reasons.[67]

## B. THE *LIFE OF APOLLONIUS*

Lucian knew the Ideal Romance but opted out of writing it. He used the characteristic material of sophistic romances in other moulds. We can compare his practice with that of other half-novelists, Imperial writers who found alternatives to the romance itself, or rather found ways of supplanting its sentimental theme. The most impressive of these is Philostratus' bizarre *Life of Apollonius of Tyana*, originally inspired by Septimius Severus' consort Julia Domna. This work sits uneasily on several fringes— of history, theology, and romantic fiction alike.[68] Because of the third-century date and milieu, and the ever-present problem of Philostratus' sources or the 'identity' of Apollonius, the life is

[64] *Pseudolog.* 4; Achilles VIII.9.1.

[65] For Lucian's handling see *Theme and Variation* 18f.; and in general, M. Kokolakis, *The Dramatic Simile of Life*, Athens 1960.

[66] The verbal parallels alleged by V. Lehmann, *de Achillis Tatii aetate*, Diss. Vratislava 1910, 59-68 are still less convincing proof that Achilles drew on Lucian.

[67] The relationship postulated by E. Feuillatre (*Études sur les Éthiopiques d'Héliodore, Publications de la Faculté des Lettres et de Sciences Humaines de Poitiers*, Paris 1966, 134 f.) is highly improbable. Only a papyrus can now dislodge Heliodorus from a date after the siege of Nisibis in 351 (see Reardon, *o.c.* 335 f.). If it did, Feuillatre's arguments are still nugatory: H. must precede L.'s *Toxaris*, since he would not borrow the name of the adulteress Charicleia to serve his own heroine. But would H. need to be aware of Lucian at all?

[68] Scholarship on Apollonius has centred on the religious and biographical aspects of this complex work. For the fabulous, there is valuable material in E. Meyer *H* 52 (1917), 371-424; F. Solmsen, *PW Philostratos*, Suppl. XX.1. 139-154; and especially H. Rommel, *Die naturwissenschaftlich-paradoxographischen Excurse bei Philostratos, Achilleus Tatios und Heliodoros*, Stuttgart 1923, 1-59.

seldom seen in literary terms:[69] the spectre is too bizarre to contemplate. I intend to show elsewhere that it is in many ways closer to the *Lives of the Sophists* than is generally allowed. But it is also useful to compare its contents with Lucian's output, since both authors are, apart from Aelius Aristides, the most extensive surviving representatives of the Second Sophistic.

It would be difficult to find a work which contains so constant a supply of parallels to every aspect of Lucian. A large cross-section of the situations are naturally similar to the paradoxography in *VH* and the *prolaliae*. At Tyana there is a magic well which makes perjurers confess; Lucian gives the topos a rhetorical twist —a well in India makes people resume where they left off their rantings the previous year.[70] In Media Apollonius discovers a strange community of Eretrians; Lucian finds fellow-Greeks on the moon or inside the whale.[71] The Eretrians have their bowels stopped with pitch: Lucian's moonmen have none at all.[72] Apollonius meets an Empousa; the account is similar to Lucian's story of Eucrates' meeting with Hecate.[73] Apollonius' arrival in India requires a reminiscence of Dionysus' visit, and the boundary-stone to mark Alexander's conquests; Lucian finds a boundary-mark left by Dionysus and Heracles.[74] Apollonius sees centaurs and stag-antelopes in the sky; Lucian (characteristically) fights a battle with them.[75] His vine-women combine the attributes of Apollonius' tree-nymphs and piebald women, and the Nereid-harpy on its island.[76] Apollonius' visit to India is closely reminiscent of the banquet in the Islands of the Blest, with its automatic servants.[77] Both authors manage to include most of the other paradoxographic sights: the Colossus of Memnon,[78] gold-digging animals,[79] hunting for new kinds of game (lizards in India or snakes in Libya);[80] shadow-feet, parodied by Lucian as phallonauts;[81] men living on

---

[69] See however E. Schwartz, *Fünf Vorträge über den griechischen Roman*², Berlin 1943, c. V.; Reardon, 265-8.
[70] I.6/*Bacch.* 7.
[71] I.24/*VH* I.11, I.34.
[72] I.24/*VH* I.23.
[73] II.4/*Philops.* 22 ff.
[74] II.9; II.43/*VH* I.7.
[75] II.22/*VH* I.12 ff.
[76] VI.10; VI.13; III.56/*VH* I.8.
[77] III.27/*VH* II.14.
[78] VI.4/*Philops.* 33.
[79] III.48/*Gall.* 16.
[80] III.8/*Dips.*
[81] III.45/*VH* II.45.

fish;[82] numerous hybrid creatures;[83] and the inevitable Brahmans.[84] Of Philostratus' repertoire only the Indian magnetic stone, the Pantarbe, has no equivalent in Lucian, who has little interest in metals even for the routine purposes of rhetoric.

A number of other parallels are related to Lucian's interest in the θεῖος ἀνήρ: Apollonius is seen as the re-incarnation of Proteus;[85] Lucian's Peregrinus takes over the god's name as his own title. A thunderbolt poised to fall on Apollonius returns to heaven; Lucian provides a similar miracle for the death of Alexander of Abonoteichos.[86] Apollonius remembers his previous incarnation as a pilot; Lucian's Pythagoras recalls a long list of banal occupations in his own past.[87] Philostratus makes much of daemonic possession and quack cures—the basic material for the tales in *Philopseudes*.[88] Apollonius' powers are well advertised by an oracle, like those of the Neo-Pythagorean Alexander of Abonoteichos;[89] and he appears in Smyrna and Ephesus simultaneously, as Pythagoras did in Thurii and Metapontum: Lucian makes much of attacking those who claim to be in two places at once, including Heracles and Alexander the Great.[90] Inevitably there are erotic enchantments as well: Apollonius has to rescue his pupil from a Corinthian witch, and lovers once more resort to magic;[91] the Hyperborean magician in *Philopseudes* summons a courtesan for a pupil at his teacher's request!

Many other areas of common interest belong to the realm of *apomnemoneumata*: Apollonius reacts against Antioch, as Lucian's Nigrinus reacts against Rome;[92] he denounces hot baths and criticises the Spartans for depilation: Lucian's Demonax has *bons mots* on both.[93] Both men oppose gladiators at Athens or whippings at Sparta,[94] and like Nigrinus Apollonius condemns horse-racing

---

[82] III.55/*VH* I.34.
[83] III.45, VI.24/*VH passim*.
[84] II.27 ff./*Tox*. 34.
[85] I.4/*Peregr*. 1.
[86] I.5/*Alex*. 40.
[87] III.24/*Gall*. 20.
[88] IV.10, III.38/*Philops*. 16, 7-10.
[89] IV.1/*Alex*. 11.
[90] IV.10/*D. Mort*. 16; 13.3.
[91] IV.25, VII.39.
[92] I.16/*Nigr*. 17 ff.
[93] I.16, cf. IV.42/*Dem*. 42, 50.
[94] IV.22/*Dem*. 57; VI.20/*Dem*. 46.

factions.[95] His virulence against the rich fool who trains birds matches Lucian's against the ignorant book-collector;[96] he listens to barbarians condemning Greek institutions, like Solon in *Anacharsis*;[97] and he delivers a tirade on slander similar to Lucian's *Calumnia*. Both authors satirise untruthful myths,[98] attack conventional philosophers, or criticize the Roman establishment through a mouthpiece.[99]

Other points of contact again belong either to rhetoric or to the borderline between rhetoric and philosophy. Apollonius' contretemps at the river Euphrates is a typical Philostratean *plasma*: the sage is to declare his female companions—Temperance, Justice, and the rest—to the customs officer. Lucian has several parallels: Philosophy and Justice have a decorative retinue of allegorical figures; and Charon acts as a customs officer at the Styx, banning the import of various commodities such as insolence and shamelessness into Hades. The Allegories turn out to be Apollonius' mistresses: Lucian is likewise married to Rhetoric and takes Dialogue as his lover.[100] In the same vein Philostratus conflates the 'choice of Heracles' motif (*Somn.* and *Rh. Pr.*) with the 'choice of philosophies' developed in *Vit. Auct.*, *Neky.* and *Icar.*: Apollonius is offered a *syncrisis* of Indian and Egyptian sages![101] The 'disappointed traveller' is also included: Lucian goes to the Po and finds that the natives have not heard of amber; Apollonius goes to India and finds that the Brahmans know no springs of golden water.[102] Barbarians duly misunderstand Greek institutions: the Gadeirans think Nero conquered the Olympians; Lucian's Anacharsis fails to grasp the point of athletic competitions, and thinks they should be more military;[103] a tragic actor drives the people mad at Ipola, while in Lucian an actor drives the Abderites into a fit of tragic recitations.[104]

Much of Philostratus' purely decorative material coincides neatly with Lucian's. Apollonius is compared to a young eagle who outsoars

[95] V.26/*Nigr.* 29.
[96] VI.36/*Adv. Ind. passim.*
[97] III.19, 25/*Anach.*, *Tox. passim.*
[98] VI.13/*Calumnia*; V.16/*Sacr.* 6.
[99] II.29/*Fugit.* 12 ff.; *Pisc.* 29 ff.; III.25/*Nigr.*
[100] I.20/*Pisc.* 16; *D.Mort.* 10.8; *Bis Acc.* 31.
[101] VI.10.
[102] III.45/*Electr.* 3.
[103] V.8/*Anach.* 31 ff.
[104] V.9/*Hist.* 1.

his parents: Lucian developed the idea as a whole dialogue, by making Menippus imitate Icarus and not Daedalus; and Peregrinus also casts himself as an eagle.[105] Both writers introduce court intrigue,[106] buried treasure discovered,[107] wrongful accusation in Egypt,[108] exotic banquet-scenes in a far-off Utopia,[109] and a frivolous mock-decree.[110] Many of the standard topics appear in Philostratus as matters for 'learned' discussion:[111] the presentation of the gods in art;[112] the conventional tirade against philosophers;[113] the gods as good men;[114] Homer and Odysseus against Palamedes (Lucian sets them against Thersites);[115] the pilot doubling Malea;[116] Hellenodikai and their lots;[117] criticisms of the Homeric poems—by eyewitnesses;[118] condemnation of lascivious dancing;[119] and encomia on trifles.[120] Both writers incorporate the full complement of 'handbook' illustrations and 'Platonic' decorations, from tales of flute-players and similes about actors, navigation and mad dogs[121] to Stesichorus' palinode and the *Phaedrus* plane-tree.[122]

This assembly of parallels can be seen in two ways: either they indicate a common tradition, which would then certainly be a Pythagorean biography,[123] or we are dealing once more with similar mosaics of rhetorical topoi. Philostratus would then have united several distinct strands of the sophists' repertoire which Lucian normally keeps in separate compartments: stories about miracle-

---

[105] I.7/*Icar.* 13; cf. *Peregr.* 39.
[106] II.32, VIII.25/*Icar.* 15, *Gall.* 25.
[107] II.39, cf. VI.39/*Tim.* 41, *Navig.* 20.
[108] V.24/*Tox.* 28.
[109] II.28, cf. *VH* II.14 ff.
[110] VI.21/*Tim.* 50, *Pisc.* 41; for other parallels, *Theme and Variation* 104 ff.
[111] For this technique in Lucian, *Theme and Variation* c. VIII.
[112] II.22/*Imagines, pro Imaginibus.*
[113] II.29/Lucian *passim.*
[114] III.18/*Tox.* 1 ff.
[115] III.22, cf. *VH* II.20.
[116] III.23/*Navig.* 9.
[117] VI.30/*Herm.* 39 ff.
[118] IV.11-16/*Gallus* 13 ff.
[119] IV.21/*de Saltatione* 1.
[120] IV.30/*Musc. Enc., Podagra.*
[121] Flute-playing, V.21/*Harm.*; actors, VI.11/*Neky.* 16, navigation, IV.9/*J. Trag.* 46 ff.; mad dogs, VI.43/*Nigr.* 38.
[122] Stesichorus, VI.11/*pro Imag.* 15; plane-trees, VII.11/*Anach.* 17.
[123] See Lévy, *Sources, o.c.*, supra c. II.n. For (unconvincing) attempts to analyse Lucian's *Peregrinus* and *Alexander* along similar lines, *Theme and Variation* 52 ff., 72 ff.

mongers, travel and paradoxography, philosophical discussions, and the normal anecdotage which reflects the sophistic milieu. Lucian himself might easily have combined any or all of those had he been performing before Julia Domna rather than Panthea. Only the theory of independent rhetorical mosaics is really consistent with what else we know about both writers: it is inconceivable that Lucian's *paideia*—or Philostratus' for that matter—can be so easily narrowed down to a single Pythagorean *Urquelle.*[124] That would simply take the pleasures of literary *plasma* right out of the sophist's profession.

On this view the 'Pythagorean' element in the *Life of Apollonius* falls into place. This in itself is just so much religious rhetoric, blown up to fill the gap left by the ideal lovers (erotic incidents are there, but much reduced in scope). This example can also shed some light on the 'religious dimension' of the novel.[125] In the ideal Romance religious paraphernalia is a 'sensational' feature; in Apuleius it is not so much a piece of personal biography as a conversion scene clumsily tagged on; in Philostratus it is simply the ingredient which has been allowed to grow to the greatest proportions. And as in Apuleius it serves to 'elevate' the subject-matter. Philostratus has passed off romance as devotional biography. The resulting ensemble is comparable not so much to Lucian's *Peregrinus* or *Alexander* as to *Icaromenippus* and *Nekyomanteia* carried to the greatest possible length.

### C. DIO'S *EUBOICUS*

Lucian can equally well be related to a very different product of the second Sophistic, the *Euboicus* of Dio of Prusa (*Or.* VII). This work has received little scholarly attention, and that has been mainly concerned with its evidence for the philosopher or the economic and social historian.[126] Dio sets out, by means of a long

---

[124] For the problem of Heracleides Ponticus, see *supra* 27 n. 66.

[125] For the weaknesses of the Kerenyi-Merkelbach theory, see R. L. Turcan, *RHR* 163 (1963), 149-199, and Reardon, *o.c.* 393 ff., who stresses the problem of fitting Charito into a cult-myth.

[126] D. Reuter, *Untersuchungen zum Euboikos des Dion von Prusa,* Diss. Leipzig, Weida (Thuringia) 1932 correctly stresses the artificial nature of Dio's *Ich-erzählung.* After some hesitation she takes it to be a prose idyll (pp. 20-23), and so cites her parallels from Theocritus and his Roman imitators; cf. von Arnim, *Leben und Werke des Dio von Prusa,* Berlin 1898, 492 f. Perry, *Ancient Romances* 70, correctly sees it as the work of a non-practising novelist.

illustrative anecdote, to highlight problems of rural depopulation and urban poverty in Greece under the early Empire. That evidence is little diminished whether the details are authentic or not, but Dio's illustration is also important for the history of rhetorical fiction.

The *mythos* (1-81) takes up the first half of the speech, and falls into two parts: an elaborate frame, in which he describes his own experience when he is shipwrecked on Euboea and receives hospitality from the hunters there; and an inset account, when his host gives an account of his journey to the mainland. The whole point of Dio's narrative is characteristic of the second century: the idealisation of the Greek past,[127] and the praise of primitive simplicity with its Cynic as well as rhetorical overtones. There are a number of points of contact with Lucian, and several with Philostratus' *Heroicus*, whose vinedresser in the Troad comes close to a doublet of Dio's Euboean huntsman. The similarities can be conveniently noted section by section:

1 ff. Dio describes what he himself has seen, without recourse to hearsay. This is simply the normal formula for beginning a fictitious tale: it is common enough to be parodied by Lucian several times, in his essay on historiography, and again in *Verae Historiae*.[128] Dio describes himself as a garrulous old man and a wanderer: the pose is also used by Lucian in practically identical terms in his *prolaliae Heracles* and *Bacchus*, where he is making a comeback later in life and looks back at his earlier travels.[129] The scene of the action is deliberate: Boeotia is the centre of Greece and the primitive heartland; both Lucian and Philostratus offer a portrait of Agathion, another child of nature who inhabits the interior of Attica itself.[130]

2: Dio is shipwrecked on a notorious stretch and stormbound in Euboea, when he meets a native hunter. This topos also provides the setting of Philostratus *Heroicus*, where a Phoenician sailor is stormbound in the Troad and meets a native vinedresser; and Lucian's Charon obtains a day's shore leave but is lost on earth until he meets Hermes.[131] The humble native turns out however to

---

[127] See E. L. Bowie, *Past and Present* 46 (1970), 1-41.
[128] *Hist.* 29; *VH* I.4.
[129] *Her.* 8; *Bacch.* 7.
[130] *VS* 552 ff., *Dem.* 1 (as Sostratus).
[131] *Heroicus* p. 283 Kayser; *Charon* 1.

be an expert in weather signs; Philostratus' vinedresser has a similar expertise, being skilled at his own calling as well as a philosopher in disguise; and Lucian's Charon also turns out to be accomplished not only in the technical skills of navigation but in versemaking as well.[132]

8-18: This setting acts as a frame for various moralising topoi. Dio develops the comparison between town and country, as do Lucian and Philostratus in similar contexts: the rustic Pan in *Bis Accusatus* knows nothing of cities and their debauched philosophers; [133] and the praise of poverty is *de rigueur* from the mouth of the vinedresser. Wealth is dangerous: in Dio the Emperor has confiscated the original master's estate; Lucian's rich men are always exposed to the envy of tyrants.[134] Dio's hunter has no need for expensive equipment; Lucian uses the same topos in several guises: it fits equally well into the mouth of cobblers or parasites.[135]

21-42: Dio develops the motif of the rustic making his first bewildered acquaintance with civilisation: the Euboean is surprised at the sight of a town, like Lucian's Charon or his Scythian Anacharsis; [136] nor has he seen money before, just as Charon knows bronze but not gold.[137] The crowd laughs at the spectacle of a stranger in town, as Lucian's Athenians are amused at Anacharsis' dress.[138] The Euboean has not seen a theatre before, and describes it in terms of a ravine: Anacharsis is likewise bewildered by a theatrical performance.[139] And he is wrongfully accused of piracy and brigandage; Lucian's Antiphilus also finds himself on a trumped-up charge in a strange city.[140] He listens to a debate on his case by two speakers (reminiscent of the two orators in Lucian's *Rhetorum Praeceptor*); a third man intervenes with decisive effect, as in *Eunuchus* and *D. Mort.*[141] The new arrival turns out unexpectedly to be a long-lost acquaintance: Lucian's Scythian

---

[132] *Charon* 6, 7 ff.
[133] *Eub.* 8, cf. *Her.* 285K; *Bis Acc.* 9-11.
[134] *Eub.* 11/*Timon* 6, 36 f.; 12/*Gall.* 22, 29; *Sat.* 26 f., 35.
[135] *Eub.* 13 ff./*Katapl.* 15, *Paras.* 17.
[136] *Eub.* 22/*Charon* 6, 15, 23; *Scytha* 3.
[137] *Ibid.*/*Charon* 11, cf. *Her.* 284.
[138] *Eub.* 29/*Scytha* 3.
[139] *Eub.* 24/*Anach.* 23.
[140] *Eub.* 27 ff., cf. 21 *supra.*
[141] *Eub.* 53 ff./*Eun.* 10, *D. Mort.* 13.

*prolalia* contains the same topos: Toxaris rescues Anacharsis when he is lost in Athens.[142]

43-58: The Euboean offers a 'rustic' tribute to his hosts—four deerskins, because his bearskins are too rough! Lucian's Ganymede shows the same pastoral simplicity and can only offer a billy-goat as his ransom.[143] The Euboean describes how he was confronted with men looking for buried treasure, and acquitted himself smartly. This is similar to the end of Lucian's *Timon*, where the misanthrope, now a poor country farmer, drives off four city types who want a share in his gains.[144] The Euboean merely laughs at the men sent to hunt for wealth; there is a similar situation in Lucian's *de Electro*, where the natives of the Po laugh when Lucian himself comes expecting to find precious amber growing there on trees.[145]

59-80: Dio describes a rustic marriage in Euboea: a young hunter boasts his accomplishments to his love, in the manner of Polyphemus to Galatea; Lucian adapted the latter scene in two parts in *D. Mar.* 1, *D. Meretr.* 14. Dio takes the opportunity to moralise by comparing the humble board and the rich man's table, or the rustic and the sophisticated wedding; Lucian also works a narrative round each of them in *Gallus* and *Convivium.*[146]

These parallels make it very easy to see how readily a piece of prose fiction can be forged together almost entirely out of separable rhetorical clichés: had Lucian not chosen to make prose dialogue his medium, the *Charon* and *Timon* and some of the miniature dialogues would have emerged even more like the *Euboicus*: indeed the lost *Sostratus* may well have looked something like this. Is the *Euboicus* then a novella and nothing else, or is it a very long *lalia* or a very short novel? [147] Or does its very existence make these labels look artificial, since it shows that rhetorical and romantic stories can be improvised by a sophistic writer *at any length* to suit

---

[142] *Eub.* 59 ff. Again an overworked topos in Lucian: see *Theme and Variation* 109 ff.

[143] *D. Deor.* 20.7; 4.2.

[144] *Eub.* 21, 48/*Tim.* 42.

[145] *Eub.* 42/*Electr.* 3.

[146] *Gall.* 11, 22; cf. *Sat.* 22 f., 28; *Conv.* 35.

[147] Perry (*Ancient Romances* 70, 79) insisted that novel and novella could have nothing in common because they were separate institutions, with the novella always subordinate to something else; Dio was bound by no such strictures.

the purpose of the moment? All the ingredients of the normal romance are here, and they are only slightly out of sequence—shipwreck, pirates, the wicked conspirator, the great debate with eleventh-hour intervention, and the innocent lovers with their love still unconsummated. If we add Longus' *Daphnis and Chloe* to the parallels between Dio and Lucian we have a still clearer picture of the community of themes. The *Euboicus* is the bridge between Lucian's *rhétorique appliquée* and the 'Pastoral Novel'. To explain its 'evolution' there is no need to resort to travel-romance (the action is spread no further than the straits of Euboea); or local tradition (it could have been set almost anywhere else); still less historiography (it takes place in the present); or religious mysticism (a 'Cynic' ethic provides the point for Dio's subsequent sermon). Dio's narrative is neither an independent novella, nor is it really subordinate to his Cynic homily; nor is it 'romantic' to the exclusion of being humorous or even satirical; like much of Lucian's own work it defies convenient description. But it shows that rhetoric can father romantic fiction.

Lucian's repertoire, then, will overlap substantially with any contemporary rhetorical *plasma*. The Ideal Romances represent only one way of organising it; but other paths were open and Lucian exercises his independence accordingly; what others could turn into pious phantasmagoria or idyllic novella he can remould as satirical entertainment.

CHAPTER SEVEN

# POINTS OF CONTACT: COMIC NOVEL AND COMIC TALE?

This chapter deals exclusively with fragments and testimonia, ranging from surviving portions of the *Satyricon* to the single word of Aristides of Miletus. In the face of the evidence we can only hope to qualify some of the half-truths about Lucian and the Comic Novel, and add still more unknowns to the many traditional ones.

## A. CONTACTS WITH THE *SATYRICON*?

At first sight there seems little point in comparing two writers so vastly different in background as Lucian and Petronius. The ethos of Nero's court or Silver Age rhetoric and satire is fairly far removed from that of the literary salons reflected in Philostratus' *Lives of the Sophists*: one has only to compare Lucian's rather delightful courtesans with Quartilla to realise that Petronius' realism has a far more individual stamp than Lucian's. Few scholars have been drawn to make comparisons—it is perilous enough to compare even Petronius and Apuleius.[1] But Petronius and Lucian do have three things in common: they were rhetorically trained writers; they wrote comic novels; *and* they made use—somehow or other—of Menippean Satire.[2] They are in fact the only extant writers who certainly employ this combination, and that in itself calls for further investigation.

---

[1] The well-worn problem of *Petronio in Apuleio* is a separate issue: scholars who compare the two are concerned to find how much of the *additional* material in Apuleius came from his knowledge of Petronius, and that amounts to very little. See A. Collignon, *Étude sur Pétrone*, Paris 1892, 388-90; against the gross exaggerations of V. Ciaffi, *Petronio in Apuleio*, Turin 1960, see R. Browning, *CR* 12 (1962), 97 f.; P. G. Walsh, *The Roman Novel*, Cambridge 1970, 30 f.; A. Scobie, *Aspects of the Ancient Romance and its Heritage*, Meisenheim 1969, 101 ff.

[2] For recent syntheses on the 'balance' of genres in Petronius. see J. P. Sullivan, *The Satyricon of Petronius*, London 1968, 89-101; Walsh, *Roman Novel*, *o.c.* 18-30. The basic positions are argued by R. Heinze, *H* 34 (1899), 494-519 (novel); E. Klebs, *Ph* 47 (1889), 623-635 (epic); G. Highet, *TAPhA* 72 (1941), 176-194 (moral satire). There is a persuasive reassessment of the claims of 'Menippean' Satire, with its use of extensive literary parody, in E. Courtney, *Ph* 106 (1962), 86-100.

There are two lines of approach to the Comic Romance: Perry insisted in his preface to *The Ancient Romances* that Petronius, Lucian and Apuleius must be kept in separate compartments: 'Here we have three different kinds of books, no one of which can be understood in terms of another of the three, or in terms of traditional literary practice'. On the other side Walsh is prepared to assume the existence of a Greek comic tradition in Petronius on the strength of *Verae Historiae* and Longus' *Daphnis and Chloe.*[3] This impasse makes it all the more necessary to compare Lucian and Petronius. In the first place their temperaments are more comparable than their milieux would suggest. Both are highly sophisticated writers who think through the medium of other literature; and both are capable of a good deal of cynical detachment, at the expense of their fellow men and the literary traditions they inherited. One feels that perhaps Petronius was a slummer in a way in which Lucian was not; but even that distinction will not always hold: the author of *Pseudologista* was capable of the crudest realism. And if Petronius was Nero's arbiter of elegance, Lucian could also be ready with praise of an emperor's mistress—or of (low) pantomime to please the emperor himself. Lucian and Petronius are closer together than Apuleius is to either of them: the accident that the latter happens to write in Latin has provided scholars with a false standard of comparison.

First we may examine the parallels between the *Satyricon* and the *Onos* itself. In general we are dealing with the same dregs of society: the *Onos* too has its share of poor effeminates (the priests of Hierapolis) and shameless voluptuaries (Lucius and Palaestra, the ass and the rich woman).[4] There is also a picaresque element in common: Encolpius and his crew steal sacred cult-objects, and are caught and recognised; so are the galli when they steal a votive bowl in the central scene of the *Onos*.[5] More important: the hero is constantly made to suffer sexual humiliation: Encolpius is impotent, frustrated by Giton, betrayed by Priapus, and subjected to the sexual attentions of panders and prostitutes; Lucius is unable to approach the mares because of the stallions; and he is threatened

[3] Perry, *Ancient Romances* vii; Walsh, *The Roman Novel* 32 ff. Bürger (*Lukiosroman o.c.* 20 ff.,) had already posited a comic-realistic romance tradition, Collignon a Greek *Priapeia* (*o.c.* 323).

[4] *Onos* 35 ff.; 8 ff.; 50 ff.

[5] *Sat.* 114.5, 105.7 ff.; *Onos* 41.

with castration, not to mention disembowelment so that he can serve as the bizarre coffin for a beautiful young girl! [6] Both heroes are also entangled with a sorceress and make a wrong move: Encolpius kills the sacred goose, while Lucius' misfortune springs from stealing the wrong ointment from a witch; and in both cases there are prominent parts for the witch's maid.[7] But the hero's most important mishap is the very one which will be missed if one compares only Petronius and Apuleius: Encolpius fails to satisfy Circe sexually, and is thrown out. This is very similar to the *original* dénouement of the *Onos*, when Lucius returns triumphantly to his mistress after regaining his human form, and is discarded in the same way.[8] Given that the hero of the *Onos* spends most of his time in animal form, it is difficult to see how two novels not directly dependent could have more significant points of contact (especially when one of them is so fragmentary).

At the same time Lucian provides a convenient comparison with themes of Menippean satire. It is surprisingly hard to say what aspects of Lucian *are* 'Menippean'; only in a few satirical pieces does he use a mixture of prose and verse, and in contexts where many other elements are also at work: Helm reconstructed freely to his cost.[9] But any strong moralising or 'Cynicising' tendency will still point towards this elusive model; and so do certain other situations which reappear in Lucian. Often any new parallel can only complicate a literary texture already complex and ambiguous; nor is it likely to exclude rather then reinforce any other. We might suspect the following situations:

*Sat.* 22, 140: Quartilla and Encolpius watch the child 'marriage' of Giton and Pannychis through a chink in the door; and Encolpius spies on Eumolpus' curious sexual gymnastics with his pupil. This voyeurism in the Satyricon has aroused considerable interest because of its apparent 'modernity', and J. P. Sullivan has attempted to set it in the context of modern psychoanalysis. Walsh preferred to see Petronius in more literary terms, but still thinks that the obsessive preoccupation with scopophilia 'casts a revealing light on the author'.[10] But Sullivan's approach seems to me to fall short

[6] *Sat. passim*/*Onos* 28; 33; 25.
[7] *Sat.* 126 ff., 136.4 ff./*Onos* 11 ff.
[8] *Sat.* 132 ff./*Onos* 56.
[9] *Lukian und Menipp*, Leipzig 1960.
[10] Sullivan, *o.c.* 232-253, cf. Walsh, *o.c.* 89.

on one fundamental point: 'although we cannot say for certain what we would find in the literature no longer extant, the evidence we do have points to the *rarity* of these motifs and suggests that Petronius is not following any obvious literary tradition, or borrowing the themes from earlier authors.' But in fact scopophilia is everywhere in Lucian, in a variety of literary contexts—not least in association with Menippus, who hovers round the moon and notices a series of scandalous scenes in the boudoirs of Hellenistic courts; Lucian's cobbler Micyllus and his guide go round invisible from room to room noting one debauch after another; Pan spies on the philosophers' night-life from his cave on the Acropolis; or Megapenthes' corpse watches his erstwhile mistress sleeping with a steward.[11] It is a reasonable suspicion that both writers are adapting the theme of the Cynic κατάσκοπος to suit the occasion.

26 ff.: Both authors also make use of the tasteless dinner-party: Trimalchio's antics are no worse than those of the Roman host in *de Mercede Conductis*; and Lucian's *Symposium* is as systematic a travesty of the polite party as the *Cena*. (Menippus himself wrote a *Symposium*, though in fact both writers could easily have drawn on the details supplied by Theophrastus' *Characters* and combined them with their respective parodies of Plato).[12]

85, 140: Petronius' Eumolpus is the scholar hypocrite who makes the greatest misuse of his position as domestic tutor. The type is legion in Lucian, and several of his victims make their confessions out of their own mouths in a similar way.[13] Eumolpus also launches into verse, to the horror of his friends, and his malady is difficult to hold in check. Lucian's interlocutors are often faced with the same task: in the *Nigrinus* his display of tragic acting goes on for several paragraphs before the real performance begins.[14]

97, 104: Ascyltos has his friend Giton announced as a runaway slave; and the outraged husband Lichas catches and punishes the fugitives, identifying Encolpius by his *membrum virile*. In Lucian's

---

[11] *Icar.* 15 f.; *Gall.* 28 ff.; *Bis Acc.* 11; *Katapl.* 12.

[12] For Petronius and Theophrastus, see Walsh 133 ff. (with previous, more sceptical bibliography); for Lucian and Theophrastus, M. D. Macleod, *Mnemosyne* 27 (1974), 75 f.: there are many more.

[13] E.g. *Conv.* 26; *D. Meretr.* 10.4; *Merc. Cond.* 39; *Timon* 55. For the confessions, *Sat.* 85 ff., cf. *Rh. Pr.* 23 ff., *Icar.* 31.

[14] *Sat.* 90.1 ff./*Nigr.* 8, 12, cf. *Neky.* 1. Walsh, *o.c.* 47 f., suspected a Menippean source here; but Lucian had a number of possible models for his version (*Theme and Variation* 4 f., 18 f.).

*Fugitivi* three runaway slaves guilty of adultery are cried, caught and punished: and again this is an opportunity for an obscene remark on their virility (Cantharus and his gang are triphallic).[15] It is tempting to look for Petronius' source in Mime, but it may have coincided with a situation in Menippus: a Cynic satirist might be expected to show similar lack of inhibition to that of the mimes themselves.[16]

115: Encolpius moralises over the dead body of Lichas, now that his great ship, his favourite and his cargo are lost in a shipwreck. Lycinus makes a cynical forecast in Lucian's *Navigium* that Adeimantus will meet the same fate with his cargo of gold—and lose his boyfriend at the same time. Again there could be a model in Cynic satire (though even Helm does not press the 'Menippean' material in *Navigium*). At any rate the parallel is a warning against interpreting Petronius' moralisings at this point as genuine pathos.[17]

116: An eyewitness warns the speaker about the wicked city of Croton with its legacy-hunters. Nigrinus talks to (Lucian) just outside Rome and gives him similar warnings about the city.[18]

117: Eumolpus pretends to be a millionaire ready to alter his will, and cheats his *captatores* with unexpected conditions: Lucian develops similar bizarre bargains in *D. Mort.*[19] In both these cases it is usual to refer Petronius—if not Lucian as well—to a peculiarly Roman milieu. There is no denying the contemporary social satire here: but that does not exclude either author from using traditional 'diatribe' material as well.

118: The journey to Croton is used as the excuse for a long disquisition by Eumolpus. This is also a characteristic technique in Lucian's supposedly 'Menippean' works: journeys from heaven to earth have always to be 'filled out' with a new topic of conversation, although interludes of this kind are a natural enough device in any genre involving a journey.[20]

---

15 *Sat.* 97.2; 104 f./*Fugit.* 30-33.

16 See M. Rosenblüth, *Beiträge zur Quellenkunde Petrons*, Diss. Berlin 1909, 50.

17 *Sat.* 115.12 ff./*Navig.* 19. Perry (*Ancient Romances* 200) favours a 'pathetic' interpretation. The Virgilian overlay (deaths of Misenus, *Aen.* VI.162 ff., and Palinurus, VI.337 ff.) gains additional irony when fused with a satiric tradition here.

18 *Sat.* 116.4 ff./*Nigr.* 17 ff.

19 *Sat.* 117.4 ff./*D.Mort.* 11.2, cf. 9.3.

20 *Sat.* 118-24/*Dear. Iud.* 3-5; *Timon* 20-30; *Bis Acc.* 8-9.

Rhetoric and attacks on it are also an integral part of both writers' texture. The opening scene of the *Satyricon* at Agamemnon's rhetorical school covers almost exactly the same ground as Lucian's *Rhetorum Praeceptor*: Agamemnon embodies both Lucian's stuffy conservative and his hypocritical social climber.[21] Here however both are obviously reacting to the abuse of rhetoric common to the early Empire as a whole. Petronius has also made use of the topos 'all the world's a stage' which is so characteristic a part of Lucian's repertoire: it is certainly unwise to regard his version as due to his interest in mime, when it is also a cliché of Imperial rhetoric, and a moralist's simile older than Menippus.[22] Petronius also makes much of the confusion on board the ship, and it is tempting to relate the doomed vessel captained by the unsavoury but superstitious Lichas to Lucian's ship of fools in *J. Trag.* 46 ff.: the superstitious Timocles becomes the captain, and the heroes are in the bilges while the libertines are up on deck. But the topos also overlaps with Ideal Romance (Achilles III.5), and once more it is a rhetorical set piece in its own right.[23]

Both authors are naturally adept at parody of Epic: in *VH* and the *Satyricon* they set out to travesty the highlights of the Odyssey, though Lucian is at most merely naughty where Petronius sets our to be gross. He does however claim that a rival was involved in a grossly indecent parody of the blinding of the Cyclops: this level is reached at least in Encolpius' address to his member, recalling Odysseus' address to his heart.[24] Again, both writers were adept at ghost stories or saucy tales with the appropriate audience reactions: these are best discussed in relation to the whole problem of *Milesiaca*.[25] And like Petronius Lucian has a considerable range of sexual themes: Ascyltus' remarkable equipment attracts a crowd at the baths; Lucian's phallonauts attract attention for the same reason —at the other extreme of fantasy; [26] and Petronius will use courtesans' correspondence where Lucian writes courtesans' dialogues.[27]

---

[21] *Sat.* 3-5/*Rh. Pr.* 9-25.
[22] *Sat.* 80.9/*Icar.* 17, *Neky.* 16.
[23] *Sat.* 100-114/*J. Trag.* 46 ff.
[24] *Pseudolog.* 27/*Sat.* 132.13. In this case Lucian is talking about a bizarre stage performance; there may be a Mimic element in the Epic parody. Cf. Rosenblüth *o.c.* 44, 74, 93.
[25] See *infra* 108 ff.
[26] *Sat.* 92.9/*VH* II.45.
[27] *Sat.* 129.3 ff./*D. Meretr.*

These groups of parallels serve to underline the complex amalgam of sources which is taking place: the problem is not that there are too few points of contact, but that there are too many—in too limited a sample of Petronius, and too wide a sample of Lucian. It is impossible to establish the dividing lines between rhetoric, romance and Menippean Satire—the storm-scene is one theme out of many that is common to all three.[28] Rhetorical moralising is an obvious area of overlap between schoolroom and Menippea, and both writers are equally prone to it; [29] there may also be areas of convergence between Menippea and Mime (to which Lucian probably had access as well as Petronius); [30] and the comic *cena* is an equally pervasive and 'absorbent' genre.[31] It is unwise either to insist on connexions or to discard them: but we can still say something about the direction in which the comic romance is heading. Both authors have a large overlap in their literary tastes, and they are facing the same task: to find a framework flexible enough to serve as a container for any available opportunities for parody and moralising.[32]

Such a framework can only be travelogue. Petronius has tied himself to the framework of a bizarre journey—which is after all no more than a string of events—and has taken his opportunities from there. This has meant that the genres which are uppermost are those which themselves involve a journey—the Odyssey, Ideal Romance, Roman Satire (an anti-journey to Brundisium?), and Menippean Satire. I can see no point in arbitrating which if any was meant to be uppermost on the evidence of an indefinite length of the whole. Given the temperament Tacitus attributes to Petronius (*Ann.* XVI.18), I doubt if he himself would have minded. The two comic writers represent a Neronian Roman and an Antonine Greek response to the same problems. The significant difference seems to me to be an almost accidental one: Lucian has given

---

[28] *Navigium* 6-9/Od. XIV. 301 ff./Varro Marcipor frgt. 272 Bücheler. For a *mimicum naufragium* (Sen. Dial. IV.2.5) see Rosenblüth, *o.c.* 48.

[29] See Bompaire 354 ff. On 'thèmes diatribiques'; much of the supposedly Menippean material in Helm's *Lucian und Menipp* is of this kind.

[30] For Petronius and the Mime, see Rosenblüth, *o.c.* 36-55; since the mime itself too easily accommodated parody, we are left with a still larger collection of themes common to more than one genre.

[31] For the genre, Bompaire 314 ff.; J. Martin, *Symposion*, Paderborn 1931.

[32] For the interminable debates about the exact 'balance' between the elements, cf. n. 2 above. The debate still depends on assertion: Perry's parable of the blind men describing the elephant is relevant (*Ancient Romances* 361).

himself two attempts at Comic Romance (and several more at Menippean Satire); and he has divided his forces accordingly. Petronius set out, like Philostratus, to do everything in one. Lucian concentrates on *periplous*-themes in *VH*, with romantic motifs present only in a very sour way, and 'Menippean' material scarcely at all; in the *Onos* the mixture is different—travel is incidental, with realistic fable and mock-romance uppermost. Had he chosen to combine his two attempts into one, our view of the Comic Romance might have been rather different. But as it is, there is at least something to show for the two writers' converging traditions and intentions. It is only when Apuleius is brought into the picture that the label 'Comic romance' becomes meaningless, since he is too much of a law unto himself not to break through the boundaries of *any* genre (and we have all of him to prove it). But since the *Metamorphoses* depends so heavily on the original of the *Onos*, it is more appropriate to see Petronius in relation to the latter—and the rest of its most probable author.

B. *P. OXY. 3010*

In this kind of impasse one waits for papyri. Perry died in 1970, convinced of the uniqueness of the *Satyricon*; Walsh, writing in the same year, emphasised its Roman-ness. In 1971, true to the course of events familiar in scholarship on the novel, *P. Oxy. 3010* was published by P. Parsons under the title *A Greek Satyricon(?)*.[33] The fragment contains alternations of prose and verse; and its subject, so far as we may reconstruct it, involves characters from low life. In particular it contains a gallus, one of the type who provides the central scene of the *Onos*. It appears that one character has undergone initiation in this capacity, and that a *cinaedus* and a friend are listening to him. One suspects that an amorous escapade is somewhere in the background, but ambiguities abound, fully acknowledged by the editor. Is the intrusive verse merely 'appropriate' to the subject-matter, or is there a genuine 'Menippean' mixture? And what is meant by a τέλειος γάλλος? Is he 'a gallus in every way' or 'a gallus with his equipment still intact?' Whether the piece is from a low comic novel, a Menippean satire, or an Ideal Romance, Lucian has some parallels to offer, and not all of them are mutually compatible. I offer them without any positive solution in sight.

[33] *BICS* 18 (1971), 53-68.

In the first place, sexual curiosities are a recurrent feature in Lucian: he is interested in androgynes of any sort.[34] The *locus classicus* for a gallus is the tale in *de Dea Syria* 18-25 about Kombabos, discussed in c.V. This would relate very neatly to the papyrus: Lucian's Kombabos reveals to the king that he has now castrated himself, and in effect protests 'I went through all this for you'. Despite the obscurities something of the kind is also going on here: the speaker has become a gallus for the sake of Iolaus; he knows all, including a συνήθεια and a ὅρκος. But Iolaus is then initiated and becomes a gallus as well, thus proving the value of friendship; this in turn is similar to the rival mutilations practised by the Scythian friends in *Toxaris*.

But among the material of the comic novel[35] there is also an escapade which fits a different aspect of the scene. At *Onos* 44 the galli are engaged in a sexual episode and Lucius betrays them. There is some dialogue among them: though there is no parallel with the papyrus, this might at least suggest that galli were a part of the texture of the novel: a 'conversation among galli' might be a minor topos, just as the 'robbers' debate' is a major one. On the other hand many of the episodes in the Ass-Romance are related to fable, and this one may have been adapted direct from the source of Babrius 141 (the ass and the priests), without any reference to the novel tradition at all.

Again, even Ideal Romance is possible here. Parsons dismisses this: 'The heroes of Greek Romance do not keep such company. If we wish to provide Iolaus with a literary background, we must look to more frivolous types of fiction'.[36] But how then do we account for the situation in Antonius Diogenes, where it is a wicked priest who is the villain? Any sort of attempt on the heroine's chastity is *de rigueur* in the Ideal Romances: the intending rapist does not have to be the Persian Grand Vizier or the Queen of Babylon every time. The ubiquitous robbers and pirates are themselves a species of low life, and Gnathon, the *éminence grise* in Longus, is little more than a dirty old man.[37] Here then we might well have an Ideal Romance where the determined villain intends to seduce under a pretext of religion. This situation is certainly a

---

[34] See *Theme and Variation* 28, 95.
[35] Cf. Parsons 62.
[36] *Ibid.* 63.
[37] IV.11 f.

topos in other kinds of literature: Lucian's philosophers are almost invariably seducers:[38] and this applies to religious men as well, especially Alexander of Abonoteichos. One of his tricks is to have exhibitions of himself and a woman in a bogus religious drama: or to exercise his charisma as the priest of Glycon to obtain the favours of married women, duping their husbands at the same time.[39] And the eunuch in adultery was probably a *controversia* theme as well.[40] All we can safely say is that Lucian shows how widely this topos was in circulation, and how easy it is to ring the changes on it.

Next, Menippean Satire; and the difficulties are no less than they were in Petronius' case. We do not as it happens have any examples of seduction under a religious pretext; but once more Lucian's *Fugitivi* offers us a situation where three slaves have conspired together to kidnap and rape a woman by masquerading as philosophers. The captive is overheard speaking a prophecy in hexameters, so that we have another mixture of prose and verse —however perfunctory. A prototype of this situation in Menippus or a tradition stemming from him might again account for the fragment.[41]

This extract, then, fits three very different places in Lucian: but this only serves to prove that all things are possible when the evidence is sufficiently slight. It also shows that we are dealing with highly versatile thematic material which is at home in a number of genres in the mid-second century A.D. That in itself enlarges our knowledge of Lucian and contemporary rhetoric: and it suggests that the boundaries erected between the genres are extremely flimsy. If the passage *is* from a Greek *Satyricon*, then none of the parallels with other genres can be laid aside, though those between Lucian and Petronius assume a new significance; we must be content to guess that this prototype was as elusive as its more durable progeny, the *Satyricon* itself.

## C. LUCIAN AND THE *MILESIACA*

Aristides' *Milesiaca* provided innocent enjoyment for its ancient readers, and has been an intractable nuisance for scholars ever

---

[38] See note 13 *supra*.
[39] *Alex.* 39, 42.
[40] See Lucian's *Eunuchus* 10.
[41] *Fugit.* 30.

since.[42] If we do have any genuine tales from Aristides we do not know which they are; [43] all we can say is that one writer *claims* to be writing something that is *somehow* 'Milesian'. On the strength of that scholars have been able to see the *Milesiaca* as including the *Onos* frame, to say nothing of *Toxaris* and *Philopseudes*. Before we can estimate what connexions Lucian might have had with them, we have to form some notion of what an ancient reader could have understood by the term.

The difficulty is this: apart from Apuleius, the testimonia [44] seize on one particular: *Milesiaca* are dirty stories, whatever else they may be: 'Swedish' has recently acquired the same kind of connotations in English; the term is a polite and knowing euphemism for pornography. But Apuleius is the only writer to connect it with his own work: [45] he uses it to announce one of the most hopelessly miscellaneous products in ancient literature, and his evidence has given rise to a multitude of problems. Does the term refer to the frame tale, to all the individual tales, or to the style and tone? [46] If it refers to the inserted tales, can it convincingly be made to fit *Cupid and Psyche*, the curious episode of the fish in the market-place, and the smutty tale of Barbarus and Myrmex all at the same time? Do tales of wonder qualify as *Milesiaca* as well as dirty stories, where the two categories are separate? [47] Was Aristides' collection a varied one,[48] in which case its reputation was over-

---

[42] Extensive summaries of the Milesian problem: H. Lucas, *Ph* 66 (1907), 16-35; Q. Cataudella, *La novella greca*, Naples 1957, 126-164; S. Trenkner, *Greek Novella* 172-177.

[43] Attempts to identify fragments of the *Milesiaca* have persistently foundered: against R. Reitzenstein, *Das Märchen von Amor und Psyche bei Apuleius*, Leipzig 1912, 49-73, see H. Werner, H 53 (1918), 253 f.; against Kerenyi, *Die griechisch-orientalische Romanliteratur in religionsgechichtlichen Beleuchtung* 162 n. 38, 205, 203 f., D. S. Robertson, *CR* 42 (1928), 231; against Mazzarino's theory (*La Milesia e Apuleio*, Turin 1950) that the so-called *spurcum additamentum* at Apuleius X.21 is a fragment of Sisenna's translation, see E. Fraenkel, *Eranos* 51 (1953), 151-154; S. Mariotti, *SIFC* 27-28 (1956), 229-250.

[44] Conveniently collected by Cataudella, 133-137.

[45] *Sermone isto Milesio Met.* I.1.1.

[46] For the *Milesiaca* as a *Rahmenerzählung*, O. Schissel, *Entwicklungsgeschichte des griech. Romans, Rhetorische Forschungen* II, Halle 1913; as individual tales, Rohde[3] 584 ff., 612 f.

[47] E.g. Paratore, *La novella in Apuleio*[2], Messina 1942, 17; Walsh sometimes tends to convert the probability into an assumption, *o.c.* 14 f., 18, 149 n. 2; Perry, *Ancient Romances* 93 ff. simply omits it altogether.

[48] Cf. Trenkner 176 f.; on present evidence the problem is as hopeless as

simplified and the testimonia have narrowed the term? Or is Apuleius the one who is imprecise? [49] And how can Lucian help?

Both Apuleius *and* the other testimonia may be to blame, and for the same reason. Obscenity is an arresting quality when it occurs in ancient literature. Where it does appear it may well colour the reader's impression of all that surrounds it. When Photius describes either the extant *Onos* or Achilles Tatius, he dismisses both of them as full of unspeakable obscenities.[50] This is really wide of the mark, but it is true to the impression they left on him. No doubt Apuleius would have struck him in the same way; and it is perfectly possible that Apuleius was struck in this way by his own work. He may have written the introduction with Barbarus and Myrmex, one of the last of the *Einlage*, still uppermost in his mind (IX.17 ff.); or he could have written his preface with only a vague knowledge of the material he was going to incorporate, but *before* it reached its present form in his own hands; and he might not at this stage have got round to thinking of book XI at all.[51] It is not inconceivable that a very varied collection by Aristides could have acquired a simple and memorable reputation by some similar process. We might rightly notice, however, that the tales which strike us as distinctly 'magic' in Apuleius almost all have some element of bawdy in them as well: the witches foul Aristomenes' corpse: Thelyphron is involved in a case of adultery; the witch has a lover: and even the unimpeachable Psyche is really having a premarital affair with Amor behind his mother's back.[52] But that still tells us nothing about whether magic as such was a concomitant of the *Milesiaca*.

There is a further difficulty inherent in the way Apuleius expresses himself. In his preface he is clearly bent on bringing in as much Mediterranean geography as he could manage: he is writing in his *sermone isto Milesio* a *fabulam Graecanicam*—on Egyptian papyrus, having learned Attic speech at Hymettus, the Isthmus and Taenarus before acquiring the Latin tongue.[53] In the midst

---

the 'genre' of the *Satyricon* (with which it has not surprisingly become entangled), Perry *Ancient Romances* 361 n. 7.

[49] Cf. Perry, *Ancient Romances* 254 f.; imprecision need not be confined to the narrative.

[50] *Cod.* 129; 87.

[51] See P. G. Walsh, *Phoenix* 22 (1968) 148 f.

[52] I.13.8; II.27.4 ff.; III.16.1 f.; V.28.7.

[53] *Met.* I.1.1-4.

of all this *sermone isto Milesio* may itself be something of a half-truth to supply yet another place-name. It would not be the only half-truth from a writer of Imperial prose fiction talking about his own work: Lucian is at least equivocal in his claim to be writing Menippean Satire; [54] and Achilles Tatius' Clitophon talks of a hive of stories (σμῆνος λόγων), when in fact his narrative turns out to be a well-organised unity.[55]

When we take all this imprecision into account, Apuleius need not be stretching the traditional reputation of the *Milesiaca* too far: he may be loosely applying a loose term to part of his loose-knit work. It is not excluded that he had Sisenna's translation in front of him and sought to contrive a similar mixture of elements, reproducing the same narrative mannerisms; but can we expect precision in a field which admits of none, from a writer who never knew the meaning of the word?

Thus far Apuleius and the testimonia: we can test our reservations on the other figure whom scholars have frequently associated with the *Milesiaca*: Petronius. It is a little ominous that the stock example of 'Milesian tales' normally cited is not Barbarus and Myrmex (*Met.* IX.17 ff.), but the Widow of Ephesus (*Sat.* 113). No-one will deny that this is a 'cynically conceived bawdy tale'.[56] But Petronius' name is not specifically linked with *Milesiaca*; and a version of the Widow of Ephesus does occur elsewhere, but in an *Aesopic* collection; [57] and it was, of course, also entitled to a place in any *Ephesiaca*. All this may be accidental, and a tribute to the popularity of the tale: but it is also unsettling. The real difficulties arise when scholars begin to call Petronius' tale of Niceros a Milesian tale for good measure.[58] If this were told in direct juxtaposition to the Widow of Ephesus, we could admit it by association. But it is told to illustrate a different point to a different audience, some forty sections earlier.[59] We have then to ask: *because* there were bawdy tales in a writer who *said* he was going to write *alla Milesia*, is a comic tale about a werewolf in a rather different writer also a Milesian tale, simply because it is interpolated, and Apuleius also

[54] Bompaire 558 f.

[55] I.2.2.

[56] So for example Walsh, *Roman Novel*, *o.c.* 122.

[57] Phaedrus App. 15 (Perry 543). The very popularity of such a tale makes its origins all the more difficult to trace. For its distribution, see Walsh 13 n. 1.

[58] E.g. Walsh, *o.c.* 14.

[59] *Sat.* 62.

interpolates tales? It does happen to have a hint of erotic motivation —Niceros was on the way to see his (supposed) mistress [60]—but that is treated very incidentally. If we accept this as Milesian simply because it deals with magic and is a tale, we do violence to the testimonia at our peril.

We can now look at three possible *Milesiaca* from Lucian: the story of Glaucias and Chrysis (*Philops.* 14 f.); of Deinias and Charicleia (*Toxaris* 12-18); and the frame story of the *Onos* itself. All three will comfortably fit the testimonia: they are amusing diversions, with at least some element of obscenity. And they would all suit either theory of *Milesiaca*—as individual tales or a collection set in some larger literary framework: [61] both *Philopseudes* and *Toxaris* are frame dialogues, and the *Onos* story is itself a *Rahmenerzählung* in its own right. But the difficulty is that all three can be adequately explained in other ways. In *Philops.* 14 f. the combination of sex and magic is quite incidental: summoning a lover by magic is a respectable literary motif long before Aristides; [62] Lucian's philosophers are always getting involved in erotic escapades with their pupils; and Lucian himself furnishes the valuable clue that the point of his story was a *bon mot* of his own teacher Demonax.[63] The tale in *Toxaris* looks more promising. Deinias is led astray by an oversexed adulteress and ambushed by her husband behind the door.[64] Lucian would have every reason to conceal a Milesian origin here—his stories are supposed to be recent and true to life. Once more however we have Lucian's inevitable 'adulterer unmasked', at home in any context.[65] Again, the frame tale of the ass as it stands is both bawdy and amusing. But to say on those grounds that it could be called 'Milesian' tells us little more.[66] It is also 'Aesopic' as a tale about an ass, 'Thessalian' as a tale about witchcraft, 'Sybaritic' perhaps, in view of the woman's bestiality with the ass. But even the frame is a highly composite affair. The basic motif is no more than 'a man changes into an ass,

---

[60] Niceros in fact denies this, but with a rather unconvincing parenthesis, 61.7 f.

[61] See *supra*, n. 46.

[62] E.g. Theocritus *Idyll* II; Lucian *D. Meretr.* 4. For erotic escapades, *Conv.* 26; *D. Meretr.* 10.

[63] *Dem.* 23.

[64] *Tox.* 10.

[65] *Theme and Variation* 106 ff.

[66] *Das Märchen, o.c.* 59.

and resumes his human shape by eating roses'—a simple magic theme. Some of the elaborations are certainly obscene, but Lucius' sex games with Palaestra or the episode of bestiality [67] are not strictly speaking essential to the story. To label them as 'Milesian' will not tell us whether they came from Aristides, or whether Apuleius is the first so to describe them. One of them at least was Aesopic: the galli and the ass is touched on in Babrius (though without the obscenities in the *Onos*).[68] And there is still nothing in the frame to tell us whether magic and sex was a mixture instantly recognisable as Milesian, or whether it was simply an attractive combination in its own right—as so often in the Ideal Romance.

The tale of Kombabos and Stratonice in *de Dea Syria* raises another difficulty: it is thoroughly obscene and cleverly contrived, but scholars are loth to call it Milesian because it is not about ordinary everyday life. They are apt to overlook the fact that Psyche is a princess, or that nobility is involved from time to time in other part of the *Metamorphoses*. Perry had no doubts about the matter: 'The unnamed widow of Ephesus is not a princess of the sixth or seventh century for the same reason that Lysistrata of Athens is not such ... All these are unhistorical because they belong to Comedy ... Between the novella in Ionian historiography and the novella in the comic books of Petronius and Apuleius there is no traditional or causal connexion. As historiography never develops into comedy, so the Ionian novella does not develop into the Petronian or Apuleian'.[69] Yet we find *mutatis mutandis* a number of elements of the Kombabos story among the least socially elevated of Apuleius' tales. Did he find other versions among the *Milesiaca*, with an everyday background instead of a royal one? Now Lucian made up the present version of the Kombabos story himself to serve a particular purpose: does it fit the testimonia any less because it is set at court? We have to accept that no social background can safely be excluded. Lucian could no doubt have passed off all four of his sophistic *plasmata* as *Milesiaca*—either as truth or as half-truth; and he would still not have enhanced our knowledge of Lucian, Aristides, Sisenna or the *Onos*.

---

[67] *Onos* 9 f.; 51.
[68] Babrius 141 (Phaedrus IV. 1).
[69] *Ancient Romances* 340, following Wilamowitz, *Aristoteles und Athen* II.32.

But he can tell us something about one of Petronius' tales. Walsh emphasises the similarity of presentation between Petronius' tale of Niceros and Apuleius' tale of Aristomenes. But both are equally similar to Lucian's tales in *Philopseudes*: on such evidence we ought to be able to claim that Lucian's tales are *Milesiaca* as well. But they scarcely fulfil the ancient testimonia, when the erotic element is minimal and can be otherwise explained. If Lucian's ghost-stories are *not* Milesian, why should the tale of Niceros be so regarded? Walsh however connects Petronius' and Apuleius' tales without noting the *Philopseudes* parallels, or allowing Lucian any certain share in the *Metamorphoses*. There is a danger of arriving at a flimsy and conjectural connexion when a direct link will do. We should resist explaining everything by an attractive label, or hailing material as Milesian when Apuleius could have taken it straight from a Lucianic original without its being anything of the kind.

Comic Romance and storytelling remain elusive. It is not just a question of inadequate evidence; not only is there no sure way of identifying what is 'Menippean' or 'Milesian'; Petronius, Lucian, and Apuleius are each too versatile by half in their literary interests, and too volatile in temperament, to allow any convenient generalisations. But we are still left with the suspicion that Lucian and Petronius selected some of their convergent subject-matter because it was somehow Menippean (whatever else it may be); and that parody of the Ideal Romance and sheer literary opportunism drew Petronius and Lucian closer together than is usually allowed.

CHAPTER EIGHT

# CONCLUSION

Lucian's fiction, then, has some bearing on the wider milieu of the novel. His techniques in *VH* make it extremely difficult to disentangle any of Antonius Diogenes with confidence; his associations with the *Onos* make it unsafe to attribute all the interpolated material in the *Metamorphoses* to Apuleius; and he adds still more to the overcrowded community of themes in Petronius or the 'Greek *Satyricon*'. He can be used to emphasise the synthetic nature of the *Life of Apollonius*—irrespective of its alleged sources—or of Dio's *Euboicus*. And above all he serves as a reminder of how rhetorical all fiction now is, and how easily the simplest materials of story-telling can pass from one milieu to another. Too often he shows us the risks of establishing much more than this. Where did he himself stand in relation to the novel, and what did he achieve?

The more closely one considers the field, the more obvious it becomes that Lucian's works are to be placed *somewhere* in the tradition—and the less one is inclined to say where. He does everything but write a conventional Ideal Romance, but he deserves more attention than he received in *Der griechische Roman*, where he is little more than a link with Antonius Diogenes.[1] There are two ways of defining his position: we can say that he is more concerned with half-novels than with the real thing—content to remain on the fringe of fiction and formal rhetoric, just as he is so often content to remain on the fringe between rhetoric and philosophy. On the other hand we can stretch our concept of the novel to accommodate him: a genre with no name [2] can have no definable boundaries either, and his contribution is no more outside the limits than those of Petronius and Longus.[3] We are in a realm of highly artificial rhetorical mosaic, and Lucian is part of it.

We can at least hope to see his narrative fiction in perspective against the rest of his own work. There is no question of imposing

---

[1] *Gr. Rom.*[3] 204 ff.

[2] For the problem of terminology, cf. Perry *Ancient Romances* 4, 44 f.

[3] Cf. Reardon's analysis of *Création rhétorique*, midway between traditional rhetoric and the novel, *Courants littéraires o.c.* 155-198.

a unity on the five pieces, but there is one major characteristic which is Lucian's own, and is not tied to any single literary tradition. Each of them has a leading role for *pseudos*:[4] he has produced a *periplous* which never took place (*VH*): a study of liars in action (*Philops.*); an improbable competition between a Greek and a Scythian, each challenging the other's credulity (*Tox.*); a curious metamorphosis told against a 'realistic' background (*Onos*); and a piece of 'forged' Herodotus, in which one liar sets out to imitate another (*DS*). And in all five there is intensive literary parody and pastiche—including the *Onos*, which re-interprets the Ideal Romance in Aesopic terms, and so forms a hybrid as bizarre as Satiric Dialogue itself.

Another common factor is the extent to which Lucian makes use of the themes and motifs of his elementary school repertoire:[5] he seldom misses an opportunity to 'work in' his favourite material, so that *VH* is a rich anthology of all his literary interests. Each of the others is a more or less 'specialised' work, in which he concentrates on one particular facet of his interests and translates it into narrative form—a fragment of bogus history (*DS*); a sequence of 'popular 'tales (*Tox.*); a pot-pourri of 'classical' ghost stories (*Philops.*); and an ingenious *plasma* of fables (*Onos*). The kind of humour possible in each of these varies enormously in accordance with the possibilities of the individual genre, so that each is as different from the others as all are from *VH*: we are no longer entitled to assume that it shows us the one way in which Lucian could set out to write a novel.

The most important point is that *de Dea Syria* and the *Onos* appear to be by the same author. Both of these works are highly individual, eccentric, and delicately nuanced almost to the point of ambiguity—and again completely different from each other, in spite of the unusual presence of galli. They are however by no means the most unusual works which can be fairly attributed to Lucian: the author of *Lexiphanes*, *Piscator*, or *de Saltatione* could easily produce striking curiosities. But both pieces have eccentricities comparable to those of *Podagra*, for example. Lucian does not confine himself to parodying one genre at a time, and a writer who can combine mock-encomium and paratragedy will not stop short

[4] For Lucian's *pseudos* in general, see Bompaire 694 ff.

[5] See *Theme and Variation* c. I.

of a blend of pseudo-history and religious satire (*DS*), or fable and Ideal Romance (*Onos*). For Bompaire *Podagra* is 'riche': [6] so are the other two, and even in its present form the *Onos* scarcely deserves to be overshadowed by its still more mannered Latin analogue.

Could Lucian have written a conventional romance of his own, and if so, why did he fail to do so? The question is really a matter of how he chooses to distribute his resources. If we lay side by side the material of *VH*, the *Dialogues of the Courtesans* and the *Dialogues of the Sea-gods*, and the *de Dea Syria*, we have the complete recipe for Ideal Romance—voyage, erotic intrigue, sentimental love and exotic religion. But Lucian preferred, in full knowledge of the extant genre, to opt for more traditional ways of presenting the common heritage of rhetoric and romance. Others have demonstrated his peculiar literary inhibitions in more than one field, especially in his handling of contemporary religion.[7] He is no less inhibited here. He prefers to combine his narrative with some other literary opportunities. The novellistic material in *Navigium* provides a good illustration: Lucian had all the equipment to write an extended skit on the Alexander-romance; but he does not do so. Instead he divides the Alexander material into two halves: Samippus re-enacts the campaigns, while Timolaus re-enacts the explorations and the exotic flights: but both episodes are blended with other material—the 'Vanity of Human Wishes' and the Ring of Gyges.[8] Lucian is seldom content to leave romantic material as he found it. He must divide it and reassemble the pieces in some other form.

We should not dwell on the negative effects of his literary inhibitions: Perry noticed his veneer of 'philosophy' in *Philops.* and *Tox.*, and insists that such pretences are 'only a necessary pose with which no sophist could afford to dispense'.[9] If so, why is there no similar disguise in *VH* or the *Onos*? The preface of *VH* is distinctly tongue-in-cheek about the value of literary relaxation; Perry merely wished an apologetic introduction on the latter. In fact sophistic

---

[6] 646.

[7] Caster *Pensée* 384; on Lucian's use of traditional 'Attic' decoration, see Bompaire 520 ff., rightly qualifying J. Delz, *Lukians Kenntnis der athenischen Antiquitäten*, Fribourg 1950.

[8] Cf. Bompaire 620 f., 696 (but he misses the reference to Alexander-material in Timolaus' wish).

[9] *Ancient Romances* 234.

*jeux d'esprit* were perfectly in order, as Lucian and Philostratus both realised. But Perry misses the effect of 'disguising' trite stories in philosophic dialogue: *Toxaris* and *Philopseudes* are two incongruous blends in which the dialogue as a serious literary form does not emerge unscathed—any more than it does in Satiric Dialogue itself. And in the same way Lucian uses the *Onos* to attack the novel: the usual adventures of the ideal hero are assigned to a humble ass, and the novel is brought down to the level of *Aesopica*. Lucian's 'answer' to the Ideal Romance is a creative one: a series of subtly humorous hybrids in which his natural inhibition about 'new' genres produces eccentric (and subversive) blends of traditional ones.

Can Lucian be used as a gloss on the perennial problems which surround the Ideal Romance and its development? It is clear that it is a Hellenistic genre, depending on a Hellenistic *Zeitgeist*, with a number of rather more literary relatives which are credited more or less in rotation with its parentage.[10] Lucian represents *one* reaction—among several—by sophistic writers to such a genre: Achilles overloads it with comical bombast;[11] and Longus gives it a different background with surprising results. Lucian has reacted in his own way: in an archaising age, he has found the genre most to his liking, but translated it back into terms of previous literature. Nor is he the only sophistic writer to do so: Dio Chrysostom and Philostratus both took to the common ground between rhetoric and romance to deal with local traditions (*Euboicus*, *Heroicus*); and Philostratus expands the religious 'dimension' of the novel in the *Life of Apollonius*. Now both these features have been offered as 'origins' of Romance;[12] we find that Lucian has also produced examples of nearly every 'evolution' which has been proposed—historiography,[13] paraphrase of New Comedy or Hellenistic idyll,[14] rhetorical exercise,[15] Pythagorean aretalogy, and novella;[16] and in *de Dea Syria* he even makes up a comic cult-myth of his own. We

[10] For a survey of positions, Reardon 309-33.

[11] Cf. D. B. Durham, *CPh* 33 (1938), 1-19 (arguing by a false chronology for parody of Heliodorus).

[12] Local legends, B. Lavagnini, *Le origini del romanzo greco*, *Annali della Reale Scuola Normale di Pisa, class. filos. e filol.* v. 28, 1922 (= *Studi sul romanzo greco*, Messina/Florence 1950); religious origins, Kerenyi-Merkelbach *supra* 7 n. 26.

[13] E. Schwartz, *Fünf Vorträge über den griechischen Roman*², Berlin 1943.

[14] Cf. Rohde³ 104-123.

[15] G. Giangrande, *Eranos* 60 (1962), 132-159.

[16] O. Schissel, *Entwicklungsgeschichte o.c.*

can still say nothing positive about the role of these forms in the origin of Romance. What is clear is that sophistic writers used them as alternative moulds for 'novellistic' subject-matter: precisely *because* they predate the novel they are felt to be more 'classical' and therefore more respectable; and this accounts for Lucian's preferences: he discovered his own five individual escape-routes into romantic story-telling and wrote five comic, conservative, and subtle alternatives: in this field, as in every other, he proves himself the manipulator *par excellence.*

Where then does he stand in relation to individual novelists? We can relate him in some way to all the known experimentors: like Philostratus he wants to use all the novel's rhetorical trappings and miss out the ideal lovers; like Dio and Longus he opts out of conventional romance into pastoral for his erotica (in the *Dialogues of the Sea-Gods*). But as a creative novelist he stands somewhere along the line between Longus and Petronius. Like the former he knew how to fuse romance with some other genre, with equally devastating results. But in spite of the lack of evidence, Petronius still provides the most fruitful comparison. Lucian's conservatism prevented him from writing a bizarre hybrid like the *Satyricon within a single work*: he prefers to keep his parody of Romance, his Homer and his Menippus in separate compartments.

One other point is clear: that together with Longus and Petronius he ranks in the forefront of ancient novelists. The other erotic romancers are extremely stereotyped; Apuleius has openly plagiarised, and his end product can scarcely claim to be a disciplined work of art, or indeed wholly intelligible to anyone outside its very narrow literary context. On the other hand *VH* speaks for itself, and the extant *Onos* is a neatly-organised, self-consistent and urbane amusement. Lucian can claim to have shown the same degree of accomplishment in this area as he did in satiric miniature. His achievement in the latter proclaims that he is the only rhetorician we know who could have rivalled Longus or Petronius—if only he had chosen. With them alone he deserves to be seen as a creative novelist fully in command of his medium.

Did he however mistake his own talent by concentrating on 'Menippean' and Comic Dialogue? On the strength of his extant excursions into Romance we may suspect that he missed an opportunity. So far as we know he left no work of true novel scale —the size of Achilles Tatius—with a large element of parody. It

was within his grasp to produce a bizarre love-and-travel plot with parodies of rhetorical display, *Wundergeschichte* and sentimental love all rolled into one. It may be that only time prevented him from excelling himself and using his many talents to the full; though the original *Onos*, if much larger and mock-serious throughout, may have gone far towards fulfilling the formula. But sophists thrived on success: we know that Satiric Dialogue had a direct appeal, and Lucian produced a corresponding amount of it: we cannot say what his market would have been for *de Dea Syria* or the *Onos* extended to indefinite length; we can only say with confidence that these works represent his real métier.

# SELECT BIBLIOGRAPHY

This list is not intended as a basic bibliography for either Lucian or the novel. Up to 1971 the fullest guide for Lucian is H. D. Betz, *Lukian von Samosata und das Neue Testament*, Berlin 1961, supplemented on the literary side by Bompaire and by Reardon's *Courants*. The last contains an invaluable running bibliography of the novel in the footnotes to pp. 309-403. The best bibliographical guides to the *Onos*-problem are the footnotes to van Thiel and Bianco (also to 1971). In addition there are recent *CW* surveys on the Greek novel (G. Sandy, *CW* 67, 1974, 321-59), Petronius (G. Schmeling, *CW* 62, 1969, 157-64), and Apuleius (C. Schlam, *CW* 64, 1971, 285-309); and G. Schmeling and J. Stuckey, *A bibliography of Petronius* (*Mnemosyne Suppl.* XXXIX) is in the press. Surveys are also promised on Lucian (M. D. Macleod), Philostratus (E. Bowie), and the Novel (B. P. Reardon), in H. Temporini's *Aufstieg und Niedergang der römischen Welt*, de Gruyter, Berlin, in progress. The International Conference on the Ancient Novel to be held at Bangor, Wales, in July 1976 will deal with more of the middle ground covered here: a selection of the proceedings will be published in due course.

## I. LUCIAN AND THE SECOND SOPHISTIC


Anderson, G., Lucian: Theme and Variation in the Second Sophistic, *Mnemosyne Suppl.* XLI, Leyden 1976.

Bompaire, J., Lucien Écrivain, imitation et création, *Bibliothèque des Écoles françaises d'Athènes et de Rome* 190, Paris 1958.

Boulanger, A., Aelius Aristide et la sophistique dans la province d'Asie au IIe siècle de notre ère, *Bibliothèque des Écoles françaises d'Athènes et de Rome* 126, Paris, 1923.

Bowersock, G. W., Greek Sophists in the Roman Empire, Oxford 1969.

—— (Ed.), Approaches to the Second Sophistic, *Publications of the American Philological Association*, Pennsylvania 1974.

Bowie, E. L., Greeks and their Past in the Second Sophistic, *Past and Present* 46 (1970), 1-41.

Caster, M., Lucien et la pensée religieuse de son temps, Paris 1937.

Croiset, M., Essai sur la vie et les oeuvres de Lucien, Paris 1882.

Delz, J., Lukians Kenntnis der athenischen Antiquitäten, Diss. Basle 1947, Fribourg 1950.

Groningen, B. A. van, General Literary Tendencies in the Second Century A.D., *Mn* 18 (1965), 41-56.

Hall, J. A., Lucian's Satire, PhD thesis (unpublished), Cambridge 1967.

Helm, R., Lucian und Menipp, Leipzig and Berlin, 1906 (repr. 1967).

—— *s.v.* Lukianos, *PW* XIII.2, 1927, 1725-77.

Householder, F. W., Literary quotation and allusion in Lucian, Columbia, New York, 1941.

Kennedy, G., The Age of the Sophists, *in*: The Art of Rhetoric in the Roman World, Princeton 1972, 553-613.

McCarthy, B. P., Lucian and Menippus, *YCS* 4 (1934), 3-55.

Piot, H., Les procédés littéraires de la seconde sophistique chez Lucien, l'ecphrasis, Thèse Rennes, 1914.

Reardon, B. P., Courants littéraires grecs des IIe et IIIe siècles après J.-C., *Annales littéraires de l'Université de Nantes* 3, Paris 1971.
——, The Second Sophistic and the Novel, *in*: Bowersock, Approaches (*supra*) 23-29.
Schmid, W., Der Atticismus in seinen Hauptvertretern I-IV, Stuttgart, 1887-96 (repr. Hildesheim 1964).
——, Die neue oder zweite Sophistik, *in*: Christ-Schmid, Geschichte der griechischen Literatur, II. ii [6] 688-828.
Schwartz, J., Biographie de Lucien de Samosate, *Collection Latomus* 83, 1965.
Sinko, Th., De Luciani libellorum ordine et mutua ratione, *Eos* 14 (1908), 113-58.
——, Symbolae chronologicae ad scripta Plutarchi et Luciani, Cracow 1947.
Walz, S., Die geschichtlichen Kenntnisse des Lucian, Diss. Tübingen 1921.

## II. VERAE HISTORIAE, TOXARIS, PHILOPSEUDES

Boll, F., Zum griechischen Roman, *Ph NF* 20 (1907), 1-15.
Braun, M., History and Romance in Graeco-Oriental Literature, Oxford 1938.
Cataudella, Q., La novella greca, Naples 1957.
Davies, H. H., Some ancient brooms and their symbolism, *The Classical Bulletin* 34, (St. Louis 1957), 1-3.
Herzig, O., Lukian als Quelle für die antike Zauberei, Diss. Tübingen 1933, Tübingen 1940.
Hubaux, J., Déiphobe et la Sibylle, *AC* 8 (1939), 97-109.
Kiefer, A., Aretalogische Studien, Leipzig 1929.
Koefler, D., Aberglaube und Zauberei in Lukians Schriften, Diss. Innsbruck 1949.
Longo, V., Aretalogie nel Mondo greco I, Genoa 1969.
Lévy, M. I., La légende de Pythagore de Grèce en Palestine, *Bibliothèque de l'École des Hautes Études, Sciences Historiques et philologiques* 250, Paris 1927.
Merkelbach, R., Roman und Mysterium, Munich and Berlin 1962.
Modinos, P., La lettre à Himerius de l'Empereur Julien, la Vie de Démonax de Lucien, et la Légende Bouddhique, *Bulletin de la Société Royale d'archéologie d'Alexandrie*, 38 (1949), 51-4.
Mueller, L., In Luciani Philopseuden Commentarius, *Eos* Suppl. 13, 1932.
Ollier, F., Lucien, Histoire vraie, Paris 1962.
Reitzenstein, R., Hellenistische Wundererzählungen, Leipzig 1906, (repr. 1963).
Reyhl, K., Antonios Diogenes, Untersuchungen zu den Roman-Fragmenten der 'Wunder jenseits von Thule' und zu den 'Wahren Geschichten' des Lukian, Diss. Tübingen 1969.
Radermacher, L., Aus Lucians Lügenfreund, Festschrift Th. Gomperz, Vienna 1902, 197-207.
——, Lucian, *Philopseudes* 11, 24, *RhM* 60 (1905), 315-7.
——, Griechische Quellen zur Faustsage, *Sitzungsberichte der Akademie der Wissenschaften in Wien*, 206.4, 1927.
Rattenbury, R. M., Traces of Lost Greek Novels, *in*: New Chapters in Greek Literature III, ed. J. U. Powell, Oxford 1933, 211-257.
Rostovtseff, M., Le Roman 'Scythe', *Seminarium Kondakovianum, Études Byzantines* II, Prague 1928, 138.

——, Skythien und der Bosporus I, Berlin 1931.
Schissel von Fleschenberg, O., Novellenkränze Lukians, Rhetorische Forschungen I, Halle 1912.
——, Die Technik des Bildeinsatzes, *Ph. NF* 26 (1913), 83-114.
Stengel, A., De Luciani veris historiis, Diss. Rostock, Berlin 1911.
Sybel, L., Toxaris, *H* 20 (1885), 41-55.
Schwartz, J., Philopseudes et de Morte Peregrini², Paris 1963.
Trenkner, S., The Greek Novella in the Classical Period, Cambridge 1958.
Weber, L., ὁ ξένος ἰατρός, *Mitteilungen des deutschen arch. Instituts in Athen* 46 (1921), 76-80.
Weinreich, O., Fabel, Aretalogie, Novelle, Heidelberg 1931.
Zimmermann, F., Lucians Toxaris und das Kairener Romanfragment, *PhW* 55 (1935), 1211-1215.

## III. THE ONOS AND APULEIUS

(excluding *Cupid and Psyche*)

Aarne, A., and Thompson, S., The Types of the Folktale, Helsinki 1964.
Anderson, W., Zu Apuleius' Novelle vom Tode der Charite, *Ph* 68 (1909), 537-549.
——, Das sogenannte Märchen vom Eselmenschen, *Zeitschrift für Volkskunde* 51 (1954), 215-36.
——, Nochmals: Das sogenannte Märchen vom Eselmenschen, *ibid.* 54 (1958), 121-25.
Arnim, H. von, Über Lucians Ὄνος, *WSt* 22 (1901), 153-78.
Bianco, G., La fonte greca delle metamorfosi di Apuleio, Brescia, 1971.
Bruneau, Ph., Illustrations antiques de Lucien, *BCH* 89 (1965), 349-57.
Buerger, K., De Lucio Patrensi, Diss. Berlin 1887.
——, Der Lukiosroman und seine literaturgeschichtliche Bedeutung, Progr. Blankenburg 1902.
Crusius, O., Vorlagen der Apuleianischen Metamorphosen, *Ph* 47 (1889), 448.
Dawkins, R. M., The modern Carnival in Thrace and the cult of Dionysus, *JHS* 26 (1906), 191-206.
Derchain, Ph., and Hubaux, J., L'affaire du marché d'Hypata dans les Métamorphoses d'Apulée, *AC* 27 (1958), 100-104.
Erbse, H., Griechisches und Apuleianisches bei Apuleius, *Eranos* 48 (1950), 107-126.
Goldbacher, A., Über Lucius von Patrae den dem Lucian zugeschriebenen Λούκιος ἢ Ὄνος und des Apuleius' Metamorphosen, Zeitschr. f. d. öst. Gymnasien 23 (1872), 323-341, 403-421.
Hammer, S., Accessiones ad Apulei artem narrandi aestimandam, Symbolae philologorum Posnaniensium, Poznan 1920, 31-35.
——, De amatoriis Graecorum fabulis observationes, Charisteria Morawski, Cracow, 1922, 88-123.
——, De narrationum Apulei Metamorphoseon libro decimo insertarum compositione et exemplaribus, *Eos* 26 (1923), 6-26.
——, De Apulei arte narrandi novae observationes, *Eos* 28 (1925), 51-77.
Hicter, M., L'autobiographie dans l'âne d'or d'Apulée, *AC* 13 (1944), 95-111; 14 (1945), 61-68.
Junghanns, Die Erzählungstechnik von Apuleius' Metamorphosen und ihrer Vorlage, *Ph* Suppl. 24. 1, Leipzig 1932.
Keller, O., Die antike Tierwelt, I/II, Leipzig 1909-1913.

Knaut, De Lucianio libelli qui inscribitur Lucius sive asinus auctore, Diss. Leipzig 1868.
Krappe, A. H., 'Απόλλων "Ονος *CPh* 42 (1947), 223-234.
Lesky, A., Apuleius von Madaura und Lukios von Patrai, *H* 76 (1941), 43-74 (= Ges. Schriften, Bern 1966, 549-578).
Mazzarino, A., La Milesio e Apuleio, Turin 1950.
Morelli, C., Apuleiana IV, *SIFC* 21 (1915), 119-157.
Neukamm, V., De Luciani Asini auctore, Diss. Tübingen 1914.
Paratore, E., La novella in Apuleio², Messina 1942.
Perry, B. E., Lucius of Patrae, Diss. Princeton 1920.
——, Some aspects of the literary art of Apuleius in the Metamorphoses, *TAPhA* 54 (1923), 196-227.
——, On Apuleius' Metamorphoses II. 31-III. 20, *AJPh* 46 (1925), 253-262.
——, An interpretation of Apuleius' Metamorphoses, *TAPhA* 57 (1926), 238-260.
——, On the authenticity of Lucius sive Asinus, *CPh* 21 (1926), 225-234.
——, The story of Thelyphron in Apuleius, *CPh* 24 (1929), 231-238.
——, On Apuleius' Metamorphoses I. 14-17, *CPh* 24 (1929), 394-400.
——, The Ancient Romances, Berkeley, California 1967.
Riefstahl, H., Der Roman des Apuleius, *Frankfurter Studien* 15, (1938).
Robertson, D. S., A Greek Carnival, *JHS* 39 (1919), 110-115.
Rohde, E., Über Lucians Schrift Λούκιος ἢ "Ονος, Leipzig 1868.
Rothstein, M., Quaestiones Lucianeae, Berlin 1888.
Schissel von Fleschenberg, O., s.v. Lukios, *PW* XIII, 1927, 1798-1802.
Scobie, A., Apuleius Metamorphoses (Asinus Aureus) I, *Beiträge zur klassische Philologie* 54, Meisenhem am Glan 1975.
Tatum, J., The Tales in Apuleius' *Metamorphoses*, *TAPhA* 100 (1969), 487-527.
Thiel, H. van, Der Eselsroman I/II, *Zetemata* 54, Munich 1971/2.
Thompson, S., The Folktale, New York 1946.
Vallette, P., Introduction to D. S. Robertson's Budé text of Apuleius, Paris 1956.
Walsh, P. G., The Roman Novel, The Satyricon of Petronius and the Metamorphoses of Apuleius, Cambridge 1970.
Wehrli, Einheit und Vorgeschichte der griechisch-römischen Romanliteratur, *MH* 22 (1965), 133-154.
Weinhold, K., Über das Märchen vom Eselmenschen, *Sitzungsberichte der Akademie der Wissenschaft zu Berlin* II, 1893, 475-88.
Werner, H., Zum Λούκιος ἢ "Ονος, *H* 53 (1918), 225-261.

## IV. DE DEA SYRIA

Allinson, F. G., Pseudo-Ionism in the second century, *AJPh* 7 (1886), 203-17.
Caster, M., Études sur Alexandre ou le faux prophète de Lucien, Thèse supplementaire, Paris 1938 (see also *Pensée supra*).
Clemen, C., Miszellen zu Lukians Schrift über die syrische Göttin, *ZAW* Beiheft 35 (1918), 83-106.
——, Lukians Schrift über die Syrische Göttin übersetzt und erläutert, *Der Alte Orient* 37. 3/4, Leipzig 1938.
Cumont, F., *s.v.* Dea Syria, *PW* 4, 1900, 2236-2243.
Engel, H., Die Abhängigkeit der ps.-Lukians Schrift Dea Syria von Herodot in sprachlicher und stilistischer Hinsicht, Diss. Rostock 1925.

Ganschinietz, R., *s.v.* Kombabos, *PW* XI, 1921, 1132-39.
Gressman, H., Der heilige Hahn zu Hierapolis in Syrien, *ZAW* Beiheft 41 (1925), 88-95.
Hermann, L., Nouvelles recherches sur Babrius, *AC* 35 (1966), 433-458.
Nock, A. D., Eunuchs in Ancient Religion, *ARW* 23 (1923), 25-33.
Penick, D. A., Notes on Lucian's Syrian Goddess, Studies in honour of B. L. Gildersleeve, Baltimore 1902, 387-93.
——, Herodotus in the Greek Renascence, Baltimore 1902.
Stocks, H., Studien zu Lukians 'De Syria dea', *Berytus. Archaeological Studies published by the Museum of Archeology of the American University of Beirut* 4, Copenhagen 1937, 1-40.
Strong, H., and Garstang, J., The Syrian Goddess, London 1913.
Vikentiev, V., Le conte égyptien des deux frères et quelques histoires apparentées: la fille citron, la fille du Marchand Gilgamesh, Combabus, *Bulletin of the Faculty of Arts* XI, Cairo 1949, 63-111.
Wedermeyer, O., Der Pseudo-ionismus der Kaiserzeit und die Schrift 'Über die Syrische Göttin', Diss. Rostock 1923.

A commentary by E. Will is in progress.

## V. THE NOVEL AND ITS FRINGES

Aly, W., Die milesische Novelle, *NJA* 44 (1925), 196-212.
Arnim, H. von, Leben und Werke des Dion von Prusa, Berlin 1898.
Buerger, K., Der antike Roman vor Petronius, *H* 27 (1892), 345-58.
Cahen, R., Le Satiricon et ses origines, Paris 1925.
Cataudella, Q., Il romanzo classico, Rome 1958.
Ciaffi, V., Petronio in Apuleio, Turin 1960.
Courtney, E., Parody and Literary Allusion in Menippean Satire, *Ph* 106 (1962), 86-100.
Collignon, A., Étude sur Pétrone, Paris 1892.
Feuillatre, E., Études sur les Éthiopiques d'Héliodore, *Publications de la Faculté des Lettres et Sciences Humaines de Poitiers* 2, 1966.
Giangrande, G., The Origins of the Greek Romance, *Eranos* 60 (1962), 132-159.
Heinze, R., Petron und der griechische Roman, *H* 34 (1899), 494-516, (= Vom Geist des Römertums$^3$, Stuttgart 1960, 417ff.).
Helm, R., Der antike Roman$^2$, Göttingen 1956.
Henrichs, A., Die Phoinikika des Lollianos, Fragmente eines neuen griechischen Romans, Bonn 1972.
Highet, G., Petronius the moralist, *TAPhA* 72 (1941), 176-94.
Hopfner, Th., Apollonios von Tyana und Philostratos, *Seminarium Kondakovianum* 4 (1931), 135-64.
Klebs, E., Zur Komposition von Petronius' Satirae, *Ph* 47 (1889), 623-35.
Lavagnini, B., Le origini del romanzo greco, *Annali della Reale Scuola Normale di Pisa, Class. filos. e. filol.* 28, 1922, repr. in Studi sul romanzo greco, Messina and Florence, 1950.
Lehmann, V., De Achillis Tatii aetate, Diss. Vratislava 1910.
Lucas, H., Zu den Milesiaca des Aristides, *Ph* 66 (1907), 16-35.
Mantero, T., Richerche sull' *Heroikos* di Filostrato, Genoa 1966.
Meyer, E., Apollonius von Tyana und die Biographie des Philostratos, *H* 52 (1917), 371-424.
Muenscher, K., Die Philostrate, *Ph* Suppl. 10 (1907), 469-557.
Oltramare, A., Les origines de la diatribe romaine, Lausanne 1926.

Paratore, E., La novella in Apuleio[2], Messina 1942.
Parsons, P. J., A Greek Satyricon?, *BICS* 8 (1971), 53-68.
Perry, B. E., Petronius and the comic romance, *CPh* 20 (1925), 31-49.
——, The Ancient Romances, Berkeley, California 1967.
Reardon, B. P., The Greek Novel, *Phoenix* 23 (1969), 55-73.
Reuter, D., Untersuchungen zum Euboikos des Dion von Prusa, Diss. Leipzig, Weida (Thuringia) 1932.
Rohde, E., Der griechische Roman und seine Vorläufer[5], Leipzig 1876; repr. of third edition, 1914.
Rommel, H., Die naturwissenschaftlich-paradoxographischen Excurse bei Philostratos, Achilleus Tatios und Heliodoros, Stuttgart 1923.
Rosenblueth, M., Beiträge zur Quellenkunde Petrons, Diss. Berlin 1909.
Schissel von Fleschenberg, O., Entwicklungsgeschichte des griechischen Romanes im Altertum, Rhetorische Forschungen II, Halle 1913.
Schwartz, E., Fünf Vorträge über den griechischen Roman, Berlin[2] 1943.
Schwartz, J., Quelques observations sur les romans grecs, *AC* 36 (1967), 536-62.
Scobie, A., Studies in the Ancient Romance and its Heritage, *Beiträge zur klassischen Philologie* 30, Meisenheim am Glan, 1969.
——, More Essays on the Ancient Romance and its Heritage, *ibid.* 46, 1973.
Solmsen, F., *s.v.* Philostratos, *PW* XX. 1, 1941, 139-154.
——, Some works of Philostratus the Elder, *TAPhA* 71 (1940), 556-572.
Sullivan, J. P., The Satyricon of Petronius, a Literary Study, London 1968.
Walsh, P. G., The Roman Novel: the Satyricon of Petronius and the Metamorphoses of Apuleius, Cambridge 1970.
Weinreich, O., Die griechische Liebesroman, Zürich 1962 (= *Nachwort* to R. Reymer's translation of Heliodorus, Zürich 1950).
Ziegler, K., *s.v.* Paradoxographoi, *PW* XVIII. 3, 1949, 1137-66.

# INDEX OF AUTHORS CITED

Achilles Tatius: 88f., 110, 118f. *I. 2.2*: 111 n. 55; *II. 23*: 85 n. 39; *36.4*: 88 n. 59; *37*: 85 n. 36; *37.2*: 88 n. 55; *37.4*: 88 n. 59; *III. 5*: 84 n. 15, 86 n. 48, 104; *13*: 84 nn. 5f.; *15*: 82 n. 80, 86 n. 48; *18*: 84 n. 19; *21*: 85 n. 24; *IV. 2*: 84 n. 16; *13*: 84 n. 11; *13f.*: 84 n. 14; *14*: 84 n. 12; *V.* 23: 19 n. 32, 85 n. 31; *26*: 19 n. 32; *VII. 7ff.*: 85 n. 28; *9*: 19 n. 32; *11*: 19 n. 32; *VIII. 9.1*: 89 n. 64; *10.4*: 88 n. 63; *10.9*: 85 n. 38.
Adrian of Tyre, *Metamorphoses*: 36, 67.
Aelian: 14. *VH I. 32*: 17; *II. 2*: 26 n. 63; *II. 4*: 21; *XI. 8*: 18; *XII. 8*: 80.
Aelius Aristides: 90.
Aeschines, *Fals. Leg. 156*: 20 n. 35.
Aesopica: 111ff., 118. *284 Perry*: 14; *580*: 13.
Alciphron, *fgt. 98 Hercher*: 78 n. 64.
Alexander-Romance: 117.
Anth. Pal. *VI. 27-29, 90, 192*: 5.
Antonius Diogenes: 1-7, 12, 83, 87, 107, 115.
Apocalypse of John, *IX. 17*: 3.
Apuleius, *Apol.*: 55. *Met.*: 34, 35 n. 3, 47, 49-67, 99ff., 106, 110f., 113f., 115, 119. *I. 1.1*: 109 n. 45; *1.1ff.*: 110 n. 53; *2-20*: 52, 54f., 114; *2.5ff.*: 54 n. 18; *6.1ff.*: 54 n. 20; *8.5*: 54 n. 19; *9.1ff.*: 54 n. 21; *12f.*: 54 n. 22; *13.8*: 55 n. 23, 110 n. 52; *16*: 55 n. 24; *16.2ff.*: 55 n. 25; *19.9*: 55 n. 26; *24f.*: 51, 55f.; *25.6*: 55 n. 30; *II. 2.2ff.*: 55 n. 27; *4*: 53 n. 13; *14*: 56f.; *18-30*: 52, 57ff.; *21.3*: 58 n. 46; *21.5ff.*: 58 n. 47; *22.6*: 58 n. 48; *26.6*: 58 n. 50; *27.4ff.*: 110 n. 52; *II. 31-III. 18*: 59ff., 67; *II. 32.2ff.*: 59 n. 54; *32.4ff.*: 59 n. 55; *III. 2ff.*: 60 n. 56; *5.1ff.*: 59 n. 55; *9.9*: 60 n. 58; *16.1f.*: 110 n. 52; *29*: 35 n. 3; *IV. 8ff.*: 61f.; *11*: 61 n. 69; *12*: 62 n. 71; *14ff.*: 62 n. 72; *20f.*: 62 n. 73; *Cupid and Psyche*: 67, 109; *V. 28.7*: 110 n. 52; *VI. 29*: 35 n. 3; *VII. 5.4ff.*: 62 n. 74; *6-8*: 62; *6.2*: 62 n. 76; *6.3ff.*: 62 n. 75; *7.3*: 62 n. 76; *VIII. 1-14*: 63, 67; *4.1ff.*: 63 n. 78; *10.2ff.*: 63 n. 80; *14.1ff.*: 63 n. 82; *21*: 63 n. 83; *22.5ff.*: 63 n. 84; *29*: 65 n. 96; *30*: 35 n. 3; *IX. 4-7*: 64, 65 n. 96; *8*: 64 n. 85; *16ff.*: 109ff.; *16.1ff.*: 65 n. 91; *17.1f.*: 65 n. 92; *17.3ff.*: 65 n. 93; *21.6*: 65 nn. 94f.; *22-31*: 65; *27.4ff.*: 65 n. 97; *29.4*: 65 n. 98; *31.1*: 65 n. 99; *33ff.*: 64; *X. 2-12*: 52, 65; *2.3ff.*: 65 n. 100; *4.3*: 66 n. 101; *5.1f.*: 66 n. 101; *23ff.*: 66; *23.3ff.*: 66 n. 103; *XI*: 45f., 94, 110.
Aristides (of Athens), *Apol. IX*, 88 n. 58.
Aristides (of Miletus), 99; see also *Milesiaca*.
Aristophanes: 7, 68, 87, 89. *Av. 550ff.*: 3; *Nub. 346*: 3; *479ff.*: 4; *Pax 205*: 3; *Ran. 293*: 24 n. 51.
Aristotle, *Const. Mass. fgt. 549 Rose*: 16 n. 21.
Athenaeus *248E*: 13; *249A*: 13; *575f.*: 16 n. 21.

Babrius *141*: 107, 113 n. 68.
*Batrachomuiomachia*, 3.

Catullus *66.93f.*: 2.
Chares of Mytilene, περὶ Ἀλεξάνδρου *X*, 16 n. 21.
Charito: 83 n. 1, 87 n. 51, 94 n. 125. *I. 3*: 85 n. 29; *10*: 86 n. 47; *II. 8.7*: 86 n. 48; *IV. 2.3*: 85 nn. 30, 35; *VII. 3.4*: 84 n. 7; *5.14*: 84 n. 8.

Clem. Alex., *ad Graec. II. 16P.*: 80.
Cratinus, *Pytine*: 60.
Ctesias: 1, 4, 7. *Persica, ap. Phot. Cod. 72.37a*: 80 n. 75.

Demosthenes, *Fals. Leg. 192ff.*: 20 n. 35.
Dio of Prusa, *Euboicus* (*Or.VII*): 61, 94-98, 115, 118f. *1-81*: 95; *1ff.*: 95; *2*: 95f.; *8*: 96 n. 133; *8-18*: 96; *11*: 96 n. 134; *12*: 96 n. 134; *13ff.*: 96 n. 135; *21*: 97 n. 144; *21-42*: 96f.; *22*: 96 nn. 136f.; *24*: 96 n. 139; *27ff.*: 61 n. 66, 96 n. 140; *29*: 96 n. 138; *42*: 97 n. 145; *43-58*: 97; *48*: 97 n. 144; *53ff.*: 96 n. 141; *59ff.*: 97 n. 142; *59-80*: 97.

Eratosthenes, *Katasterismoi*, 3.

Flavius Phoenix: 35f.
Flavius Phylax: 36.

Heliodorus: 89 and n. 67. *I. 12*: 85 nn. 31f.; *19ff.*: 86 n. 47; *26*: 85 nn. 25, 27; *V. 27*: 84 n. 11; *VII. 21*: 85 n. 33; *VIII. 11*: 84 nn. 20f.; *IX. 15*: 84 n. 6; *16ff.*: 84 n. 5; *18*: 84 n. 9; *22*: 84 n. 18; *X. 27*: 84 n. 13; *27f.*: 84 n. 17.
Heraclides Ponticus: 27 and n. 66, 31 n. 86, 94 n. 124.
Herodotus: 7, 19 and n. 33, 48 n. 76, 68-82. *I. 2*: 75; *8*: 79; *26ff.*: 19 n. 33; *34ff.*: 63 n. 78; *69ff.*: 19 n. 33; *82*: 14; *108*: 2; *178ff.*: 69 n. 4; *199*: 71 n. 36; *201ff.*: 69 n. 3; *II. 42*: 71 n. 36; *48, 52*: 76; *66ff.*: 15; *69*: 71 n. 40; *109*: 15; *112*: 71 n. 36; *121*: 62 n. 70; *137f.*: 71 n. 36; *149*: 71 n. 40, 77; *155f.*: 71 n. 40; *III. 14ff.*: 14; *36*: 19 n. 33; *39ff.*: 19 n. 33; *48*: 81; *72*: 15; *89-96*: 81; *113*: 71 n. 40; *115*: 15 n. 11; *119*: 15, 79; *120*: 15 n. 11; *120ff.*: 19 n. 33; *153*: 59; *154*: 79; *IV*: 17; *1ff.*: 13; *9*: 2; *28*: 4f., 10 n. 34; *37-45*: 81; *64*: 15; *70*: 15; *81*: 4; *117*: 13; *119f.*: 15; *129*: 3; *174*: 15 n. 15; *176*: 15 n. 16; *178, 180*: 15; *V. 29-32*: 17; *92*: 21, 25, 27; *VI. 29*: 17; *114*: 62 n. 70; *VII. 128ff.*: 36; *VIII. 138*: 48 n. 76.
*Hesiod, Erga 40*: 30.
*Homer*: 1, 70, 119. *Il. XIII. 311ff.*: 88; *XVI. 450*: 70 n. 15; *XVIII. 417*: 25. *Od. X. 321ff.*: 24 n. 51; *XII. 45f.*: 24 n. 51; *XVI. 301ff.*: 105 n. 28.

*Iamblichus*: 7, 84. *Ap. Phot. Cod. 74a*: 14 n. 8; *74b*: 85 nn. 23, 26; *77a*: 86 n. 49.
Iambulus: 1.

Juvenal *VI. 332ff.*: 47; *X. 304ff.*: 47.

Lollianus, *Phoinikika*: 82.
Longus: 98, 100, 115, 118f. *I. 14*: 85 n. 40; *16*: 85 n. 42; *19*: 85 n. 42; *II. 5*: 85 n. 43; *26*: 84 n. 10; *39*: 85 n. 41; *III. 18*: 85 n. 36; *IV. 7*: 85 n. 44; *11f.*: 85 n. 37, 107 n. 37; *28f.*: 86 n. 46.

Lucian:
*Alex.*: 64 n. 85, 68, 93 n. 123, 94. *5*: 28; *6*: 38 n. 27; *11*: 91 n. 89; *12*: 69 n. 7; *13*: 76; *15*: 85 n. 24; *19-23*: 78; *23*: 71 n. 33; *26*: 69 n. 8; *38*: 81 n. 78; *39*: 26, 108 n. 39; *40*: 91 n. 86; *41*: 77; *42*: 108 n. 39; *44f.*: 57 n. 44; *45*: 57; *50*: 65 n. 97; *56*: 18 n. 31; *57*: 14; *58*: 69 n. 6.
*Anach.*: 92 n. 97. *1*: 14; *1ff.*: 39 n. 33; *17*: 93 n. 122; *23*: 96 n. 139; *31ff.*: 92 n. 103; *35*: 29.

*Apol. 5*: 38 n. 26.
*Bacch.*: 30. *1ff.*: 77, 84 n. 10; *2*: 26; *6f.*: 60 n. 61; *7*: 90 n. 70, 95 n. 129.
*Bis Acc. 2*: 77; *3*: 27; *8f.*: 103 n. 20; *9ff.*: 36 n. 9; *9-11*: 96 n. 133; *11*: 102 n. 11; *15f.*: 60 n. 59; *26*: 60 n. 57; *26ff.*: 60; *31*: 92 n. 100; *33*: 60 n. 57.
*Calumnia*: 80, 92 n. 98. *8*, *16ff.*, *27f.*, *29*: 33; *14*: 33, 71 n. 39, 79 n. 70.
*Charon*: 95 n. 131, 97. *2*: 27; *6*: 96 nn. 132, 136; *7ff.*: 96 n. 132; *8*: 14; *11*: 71 n. 35, 96 n. 137; *13*: 69 n. 3; *14*: 15 n. 11; *15*: 96 n. 136; *23*: 96 n. 136; *24*: 14.
*Conv.*: 102. *5*: 4 n. 13; *12*: 38 n. 32; *18*: 17; *19*: 28 n. 71; *20*: 62 n. 71; *26*: 102 n. 13; *35*: 97 n. 146; *39*: 6 n. 22, 17; *40f.*: 17; *46*: 18 n. 26, 21, 39 n. 35.
*de Dea Syria*: 39, 43, 45f., 63 n. 80, 67, 68-82, 116ff., 120. *1*: 69 nn. 6, 14, 75; *2*: 71 n. 29; *3*: 75; *4*: 75; *5*: 75; *6*: 71 n. 31, 76; *7*: 69 n. 7, 71 n. 32; *8*: 70 n. 15, 74, 76; *9*: 76; *10*: 71 n. 33, 76; *11*: 76; *12*: 71 n. 30; *13*: 76, 84 n. 18; *14*: 71 n. 34, 76; *15*: 71 n. 39; *16*: 74; *17*: 70 n. 25; *17f.*: 65 n. 100, 69 n. 9, 79; *17ff.*: 71 n. 39; *18*: 65 n. 97, 78; *19*: 65 n. 93; *19-26*: 78-81, 107, 113; *19ff.*: 79; *20*: 80, 58 n. 48, 59; *22*: 70 n. 16, 85 n. 33; *25*: 79*f.*; *25f.*: 65 n. 94, 79; *26*: 69 n. 10; *27*: 76, 80; *28*: 70 nn. 17f., 26, 76; *29*: 69 n. 11, 77; *30*: 70 n. 19, 71 nn. 35, 40; *32*: 71 nn. 36, 39, 77; *33*: 70 n. 27, 71 n. 37; *35*: 71 n. 38; *36*: 39 n. 42, 69 nn. 8, 13, 77; *37*: 69 n. 12; *39*: 77; *40*: 77; *43*: 77; *45*: 70 n. 20; *46*: 70 nn. 22, 28, 71 n. 40; *47*: 56 n. 38, 69 n. 13, 77; *48*: 77; *49*: 70 n. 23, 81 n. 78; *49-60*: 81f.; *50*: 39 n. 40, 71 n. 38; *52*: 81 n. 78; *54*: 71 n. 38, 81 n. 78; *55*: 81; *58*: 72, 81; *60*: 70 n. 24, 82.
*Dem. 1*: 95 n. 130; *22*: 4; *23*: 112 n. 63; *42*: 91 n. 93; *46*: 91 n. 94; *50*: 91 n. 93; *57*: 91 n. 94.
*Deor. Conc. 6*: 71 n. 32; *16*: 71 n. 36.
*D. Deor.*: 73. *4*: 85 nn. 40f.; *4.2*: 97 n. 143; *4.4f.*: 85 n. 37; *5*: 77; *5.2*: 88 n. 55; *6*: 75 n. 55; *7.2*: 29; *11*, *12*: 85 n. 43; *12.2*: 28; *16*: 77; *18*: 77; *18.1*: 75 n. 55, 77; *20*: (*Dear. Iud.*) *3-5*: 103 n. 20; *20.7*: 85 n. 40, 97 n. 143; *25.2*: 71 n. 31; *26*: 10 n. 35.
*D. Mar.*: 73, 117, 119. *1*: 97; *2.2*: 63 n. 81; *4*: 46 n. 64; *6*: 29; *6.3*: 78; *7.2*: 77; *14*: 46 n. 63.
*D. Meretr.*: 30, 43, 104 n. 27, 117. *2.4*: 27; *3.3*: 18; *4*: 25, 112 n. 62; *4.4*: 61 n. 65; *4.4f.*: 54 n. 22; *7*: 65 n. 91; *9*: 18 n. 31, 85 n. 44; *10.2*: 27 n. 70, *10.4*: 85 n. 34, 102 n. 13; *11.2*: 65 n. 92; *14*: 85 n. 42, 97; *15*: 38 n. 32, 85 n. 44.
*D. Mort.*: 6 n. 23, 68. *5-9*: 20; *7*: 66 n. 101, 85 n. 26; *9.3*: 103 n. 19; *10*: 45; *10.8*: 18 n. 26; *11.2*: 103 n. 19; *12.7*: 66 n. 102; *13*: 96 n. 141; *13.3*: 91 n. 90; *16*: 75, 91 n. 90; *16.5*: 18; *27*: 16 n. 20.
*Dips.*: 15 n. 15, 30, 90 n. 80. *6*: 29, 78.
*de Domo 8*: 71 n. 35; *20*: 73, 79 n. 69.
*Electr.*: 15, 30. *2f.*: 71 n. 31; *3*: 92 n. 102, 97 n. 145.
*Eun.*: 80. *10*: 57 n. 40, 96 n. 141, 108 n. 40; *11*: 60 n. 62; *12*: 38 n. 31, 39 n. 36; *13*: 37 n. 23, 46 n. 63.
*Fugit. 1*: 70 n. 19; *6ff.*: 71 n. 29; *12ff.*: 92 n. 99; *13*: 46 n. 63; *25*: 36; *26*: 66; *29*: 56 n. 33; *30*: 108 n. 41; *30-33*: 103 n. 15; *31*: 59 n. 54; *33*: 38 n. 25, 40 nn. 44f.
*Gall.*: 48f. *2*: 46 n. 64; *2ff.*: 36 n. 9; *4f.*: 39 n. 37; *5*: 48 n. 74; *10f.*: 37 n. 12; *11*: 97 n. 146; *13ff.*: 93 n. 118; *14*: 27 n. 70, 48 n. 72; *16*: 90 n. 79; *17*: 28, 75; *18*: 71 n. 34, 75, 77, 78, 81 n. 78; *19*: 40 n. 43, 48 n. 73; *20*: 91 n. 87; *22*: 96 n. 134, 97 n. 146; *25*: 18 n. 28, 63 n. 82, 66 n. 103, 93 n. 106; *28ff.*: 102 n. 11; *29*: 96 n. 134; *32*: 38 nn. 29f., 48 n. 75.

*Harm.*: 93 n. 121.
*Her. 4*: 71 n. 36; *8*: 95 n. 129.
*Herm.*: 68. *3*: 30; *9*: 57 n. 41; *37ff.*: 21 n. 38; 39 n. 35; *39ff.*: 93 n. 117; *71*: 46 n. 63; *79*: 29; *81*: 18 n. 26.
*Herod.*: 73. *7*: 36; *7f.*: 73.
*Hes.*: 6 n. 23.
*Hist.*: 68. *1*: 60 n. 61, 92 n. 104; *1-5*: 73 and n. 47; *18*: 77; *22*: 77; *24*: 76; *28*: 56 n. 36; *29*: 79 n. 69, 95 n. 128; *31*: 11, 77; *35*: 71 n. 39, 79 n. 70; *60*: 76.
*Icar.*: 7ff., 69f., 92, 94. *6*: 70 n. 28; *7*: 70 n. 27; *9*: 71 n. 37; *13*: 26, 56 n. 33, 93 n. 105; *15*: 16 n. 20, 18 n. 28, 63 n. 82, 66 n. 103, 70 n. 25, 79 n. 70, 85 n. 26, 93 n. 106; *15f.*: 38 n. 30, 102 n. 11; *16*: 21 n. 38, 39 n. 35; *17*: 104 n. 22; *18*: 18 n. 25, 64 n. 87; *22*: 27; *25*: 70 n. 26; *25f.*: 76; *26*: 4, 26, 64 n. 85; *27f.*: 6 n. 20; *31*: 102 n. 13; *33*: 39 n. 36.
*Imag.*: 93 n. 112. *1*: 37 n. 20, 87.
*pro Imag.*: 93 n. 112. *5*: 79 n. 70; *15*: 93 n. 122.
*adv. Ind.*: 92 n. 96. *4*: 46 n. 63; *12*: 18 n. 26; *12ff.*: 76 n. 58.
*J. Trag. 1f.*: 77; *15*: 55 n. 30; *25*: 26; *26*: 71 n. 38; *30f.*: 77; *33*: 26; *38*: 74; *42*: 71 n. 37; *45*: 71 n. 32; *46ff.*: 57 n. 42, 93 n. 121, 104 n. 23; *47f.*: 84 n. 11; *51ff.*: 60 n. 62.
*Katapl.*: 45. *1*: 71 n. 36; *4*: 25, 27; *8ff.*: 18 n. 28; *8-12*: 63 n. 82; *12*: 55 nn. 23f., 102 n. 11; *15*: 96 n. 135; *21*: 16 n. 20, 18 n. 25, 64 n. 87; *22*: 24 n. 51; *27*: 55 n. 25.
*pro Lapsu*: 58 n. 51.
*Lex.*: 43 and n. 51, 72, 116. *11*: 58.
*Luct.*: 81 n. 78. *7*: 6 n. 20; *12f.*: 71 n. 38; *21*: 72.
*Merc. Cond.*: 102. *1f.*: 84 n. 15; *26*: 56 n. 34; *34*: 18 n. 26, 28 and n. 71; *35*: 26; *39*: 102 n. 13; *42*: 40 n. 45.
*Musc. Enc.*: 72, 93 n. 120.
*Navig*: 103, 117. *2*: 28; *2f.*: 4 n. 12; *6-9*: 105 n. 28; *7-9*: 19, 42; *9*: 10 n. 35, 93 n. 116; *10*: 42; *18f.*: 57 n. 43; *19*: 103 n. 17; *20*: 93 n. 107; *38*: 18 n. 25, 64 n. 87; *41-45*: 117 n. 8; *42*: 84 n. 21; *44*: 17.
*Neky.*: 7ff., 45, 92, 94. *1*: 54 n. 19, 102 n. 14; *7-9*: 37 n. 10; *9f.*: 26; *10*: 27; *11*: 60 n. 60; *15*: 6 n. 20; *16*: 93 n. 121, 104 n. 22; *20*: 48.
*Nigr.*: 92 n. 99. *7*: 86 n. 45; *8*: 22, 102 n. 14; *12*: 54 n. 19, 102 n. 14; *17ff.*: 91 n. 92, 103 n. 18; *29*: 92 n. 95; *35-38*: 46 n. 61; *38*: 93 n. 121.
*Onos*: 33, 34-49, 50-67, 68, 82, 83, 87, 100f., 106, 109, 112, 115-120. *4*: 37 n. 19, 55 n. 27; *8ff.*: 100 n. 4; *9*: 39 n. 33; *9f.*: 85 n. 36, 113 n. 67; *11*: 61 n. 67; *11ff.*: 101 n. 7; *12*: 37 n. 21; *13f.*: 37 n. 22; *17*: 35 n. 3; *22*: 37 n. 15, 61 n. 68; *24*: 35 n. 3; *24ff.*: 37 n. 11; *25*: 39 n. 34, 41, 62 nn. 72f., 63 n. 84, 101 n. 33; *26*: 61 n. 68, 86; *28*: 36 n. 23, 41, 101 n. 6; *33*: 101 n. 6; *34*: 37 n. 13; *35ff.*: 100 n. 4; *36*: 40 n. 43; *36-41*: 45; *37*: 39 n. 40; *38*: 35 n. 3, 38 n. 29, 39 n. 42, 48 n. 75; *40*: 38 n. 32; *41*: 37 n. 14, 39 nn. 35, 41, 48 n. 72, 100 n. 5; *42*: 41; *44*: 107; *45*: 37; *48*: 38 n. 25; *50*: 38 n. 27; *50ff.*: 100 n. 4; *51*: 38 n. 28, 41, 47, 48 nn. 70, 73, 112 n. 67; *52*: 38 nn. 30, 31; *53*: 37 nn. 12, 16; *54*: 39 nn. 36ff., 48 n. 74; *55*: 40 n. 45; *56*: 58 n. 50, 101 n. 9.
*Paras*: 72. *17*: 96 n. 135.
*Peregr.*: 93 n. 123, 94. *1*: 85 n. 91; *14*: 39 n. 38; *17*: 21, 75; *29f.*: 84 n. 20; *39*: 24, 93 n. 105; *41*: 26; *43*: 85 n. 38.
*Phalaris*: 62 n. 73. *I. 11*: 39 n. 34; *II. 8*: 71 n. 33, 76.
*Philops.*: 12, 23-33, 34, 41f., 48 n. 70, 49, 58 n. 45, 60 n. 65, 64, 67, 69 82, 109, 112, 114, 116ff. *2ff.*: 73; *3*: 5 n. 16; *7*: 77; *7ff.*: 54 n. 18, 74, 91

n. 88; *8*: 25; *11*: 31, 63 n. 83; *11f.*: 54 n. 18; *11-14*: 31; *12*: 25; *13*: 5 n. 16, 19 n. 34, 25f., 31, 37 n. 20, 69 n. 12; *14*: 25, 27 n. 66, 28f., 37 n. 21, 54 n. 22, 59, 65 n. 98, 66 n. 101, 84 n. 19; *14f.*: 25, 54 n. 21, 69 n. 9, 112; *15*: 29, 69 n. 11, 76; *16*: 26, 31, 91 n. 88; *17*: 31, 84 n. 21; *18*: 26, 69 n. 10, 77; *18ff.*: 26, 31; *19*: 55, 69 n. 13; *19-21*: 55 n. 26; 21: 29, 55; *22*: 84 nn. 19, 22; *22-24*: 31, 90 n. 73; *24*: 6 n. 20, 31, 76 n. 59, 84 nn. 19, 21; *42f.*: 26; *25*: 27, 31, 60 n. 65, 65 n. 99; *26*: 31; *27*: 4 n. 13, 21, 27, 32, 65 n. 95; *29*: 76 n. 59; *30*: 18 n. 31; *30f.*: 28; *31*: 58 n. 47, 59 n. 55, 84 n. 22; *32*: 85 n. 23; *33*: 21, 90 n. 78; *33f.*: 21; *33-36*: 28ff., 31, 37 n. 22, 48; *34*: 75; *35*: 31; *36*: 29f., 78; *38*: 84 n. 21.

*Pisc.*: 8, 116. *2ff.*: 39 n. 36; *16*: 92 n. 100; *29ff.*: 92 n. 99; *32*: 46 n. 63; *36*: 29, 38 nn. 25f., *41*: 93 n. 110; *44-51*: 60 n. 58; *50*: 56 n. 31; *51*: 70.

*Podagra*: 43, 93 n. 120, 116f.

*Prom. es 4*: 38 n. 25, 84 n. 17; *6*: 3.

*Pseudolog.*: 58 n. 51, 88, 100. *4*: 89 n. 64; *6*: 46 n. 63; *8*: 40 n. 45; *24*: 43; *25*: 88 n. 63; *27*: 63 n. 81, 81 n. 79, 85 n. 39, 104 n. 24; *30*: 76 n. 58.

*Rh. Pr.*: 30, 92, 96. *9-25*: 104 n. 21; *16f.*: 43; *18*: 14; *23*: 88; *23ff.*: 102 n. 13.

*Sacr. 2*: 39 n. 41; *2f.*: 64 n. 85; *6*: 92 n. 98; *9*: 73; *12*: 81 n. 78; *13*: 17 n. 24, 71 n. 38, 82; *14*: 81; *15*: 82.

*Salt.*: 116. *1*: 93 n. 119.

*Sat.*: 66. *22f.*: 97 n. 146; *23*: 29, 56 n. 35; *26f.*: 96 n. 134; *28*: 97 n. 146; *35*: 96 n. 134.

*Scytha*: 30. *1*: 17 n. 24; *3*: 14, 96 nn. 136, 138; *3ff.*: 56 n. 33.

*Somn.* (*seu Vita*): 92. *3*: 29f.

*Sostratus*: 97.

*Timon*: 7, 68, 97. *4*: 71 n. 39; *6*: 96 n. 134; *9*: 27; *18*: 29, 78; *20-30*: 103 n. 20; *36*: 96 n. 134; *41*: 93 n. 107; *42*: 97 n. 144; *50*: 93 n. 110; *51f.*: 60 n. 64; *55*: 102 n. 13.

*Tox.*: 5, 12-23, 24, 33f., 36f., 41f., 49, 58, 61f., 63 n. 80, 66f., 72, 79 n. 68, 82, 87, 92 n. 97, 107, 109, 112, 116ff. *1ff.*: 93 n. 114; *5ff.*: 71 n. 30; *5-7*: 41; *6*: 53 n. 13; *9*: 72; *10*: 12, 112 n. 64; *11*: 13, 21, 33; *12*: 21; *12-18*: 19, 23, 52f., 112; *13-17*: 54 n. 21; *15*: 85 nn. 29f.; *16ff.*: 85 n. 35; *17*: 79, 85 n. 31; *18*: 21, 62 n. 75; *19*: 37 n. 13; *19-21*: 19; *21*: 56 n. 32; *20*: 19, 21; *22*: 19f.; *24-26*: 19, 62 n. 76; *27*: 21, 56 n. 32; *27-34*: 21, 23, 53; *28*: 37 n. 14, 93 n. 108; *28ff.*: 85 n. 25; *30*: 54 n. 20; *32*: 21; *32f.*: 85 n. 28; *32ff.*: 62 n. 75; *34*: 21, 91 n. 84; *35*: 19,21; *36*: 22; *37*: 13; *38*: 13, 15 n. 17, 21; *39ff.*: 13; *40*: 14 n. 7, 58 n. 48, 63 n. 81, 79; *42*: 13, 19, 62 and n. 72; *43*: 14, 23, 62 n. 73; *44*: 16, 18 n. 25; *44-46*: 16, 63 n. 79; *44-55*: 13, 15-19, 52, 58 n. 45, 64 n. 86; *45*: 17 n. 24; *46*: 17 n. 24; *48*: 81; *49*: 18 n. 25, 62 n. 74, 85 n. 27; *49f.*: 17; *50*: 15f., 18, 84 n. 8; *51*: 4 n. 12, 18 and n. 27, 85 n. 27; *51f.*: 17; *52*: 18, 37 n. 15, 86; *52ff.*: 18; *53*: 18; *54*: 16; *55*: 17f.; *57f.*: 58 n. 46; *57ff.*: 14, 23, 61; *58f.*: 37 n. 16; *61*: 14f., 15, 79, 82.

*Tyrann. 2*: 29.

*VH*: 1-11, 12, 21, 33f., 42, 45f., 64, 67, 69, 70 n. 17, 72, 82, 83, 84 nn. 13, 16, 90, 91 n. 83, 100, 104, 106, 115-119. *I. 1-4*: 73 n. 47; *2*: 10; *3*: 18 n. 27, 24; *4*: 73, 95 n. 128; *5*: 37 n. 19; *5-42*: 9; *7*: 70 n. 20, 75, 90 n. 74; *7f.*: 2; *8*: 26, 27 n. 66, 30, 38 n. 28, 60 n. 58, 70 n. 23, 81 n. 79, 90 n. 76; *11*: 90 n. 71; *12ff.*: 90 n. 75; *12-16*: 84 n. 6; *13ff.*: 81, 84 n. 5; *14-20*: 2f.; *16*: 3; *17*: 70 n. 15, 74, 85 n. 30; *18f.*: 37 n. 11; *19*: 3; *22*: 5 n. 15, 13, 70 n. 16, 75, 80; *22ff.*: 3; *23*: 4, 5 n. 15, 18, 73, 90 n. 72; *24*: 82;

*25*: 14 n. 7; *26*: 4, 26, 70 n. 24, 84 n. 18; *29*: 69 n. 14, 70 n. 24; *30*: 4; *34*: 90 n. 71, 91 n. 82; *36*: 18 n. 25; *37ff.*: 84 n. 12; *40*: 10, 70 n. 22, 84 n. 14; *II. 1-4*: 9; *2*: 5, 10 n. 34; *4*: 5, 10, 19 n. 34, 26; *5*: 70 n. 19; *5-28*: 6; *5-47*: 9; *9*: 60; *9ff.*: 60 n. 57; *10*: 27; *14*: 29, 90 n. 77; *14ff.*: 93 n. 109; *16f.*: 6; *17*: 26; *19*: 70 n. 16; *19f.*: 6; *20*: 6, 93 n. 115; *23*: 10 n. 31; *24*: 6; *25*: 76; *25f.*: 4 n. 13; *26*: 26 n. 59; *28*: 70 n. 24, 75, 77; *31*: 27 n. 66; *32f.*: 78; *32ff.*: 69 n. 14; *34*: 70 n. 24; *36*: 18 n. 27; *41*: 5 n. 15, 10; *42*: 5 n. 16, 10 n. 34; *45*: 10, 70 n. 18, 90 n. 81, 104 n. 26; *46*: 24, 26, 46 n. 64, 48, 60 n. 58; *47*: 11.

*Vit. Auct.*: 7, 38, 92. *4*: 15 n. 17; *17*: 6 n. 22, 13; *25*: 37 n. 20; *26*: 70 n. 28; *27*: 26 n. 59.

*Zeuxis 7*: 18 n. 31; *9ff.*: 84 n. 9.

*Scholia* (p. 24 Rabe): 11 n. 29.

'Lucius of Patras': 34, 52 n. 5.

John Lydus *I. 5*: 3 n. 11.

Megasthenes: 4. *FGH II. fr. 17*: 10 n. 34.

Ps.-Menander: 47, 88.

Menippus: 2, 45, 68, 103, 108, 119.

*Symposium*: 102. See also Menippean Satire.

Menippean Satire: 99-108, 111, 114.

Michael of Ephesus, *in Arist. de generatione animalium*: 3 n. 11

*Milesiaca*: 12 n. 2, 33 n. 88, 56 n. 38, 104, 108-114.

Moschus *II*: 88 n. 61.

*Orphica*: 3 n. 11, 6.

Ovid, *Am. I. 4. 32*: 88 n. 62; *Met. I. 607ff.*: 64 n. 90; *XV. 75ff.*: 7.

*P. Cair. 47992*: 16 n. 18.

*P. Oxy. 3010*: 106ff.

Petronius: 43, 45 n. 59, 99-114, 115, 119. *Sat. 1.1*: 14; *1ff.*: 104; *3-5*: 104 n. 21; *12ff.*: 56 n. 38; *22*: 101f.; *26ff.*: 102; *61.7f.*: 112 n. 60; *62*: 24 n. 47, 111 n. 59, 114; *80.9*: 104 n. 22; *83.3ff.*: 88 n. 60; *85*: 102; *85ff.*: 102 n. 13; *90.1ff.*: 102 n. 14; *92.9*: 104 n. 26; *97*: 102f.; *97.2*: 103 n. 15; *100-114*: 104 n. 23; *104*: 102f.; *104f.*: 103 n. 15; *105.7ff.*: 100 n. 5; *113*: 111; *114.5*: 100 n. 5; *115.12ff.*: 103 n. 17; *116.4ff.*: 103 n. 18; *117.4ff.*: 103 n. 19; *118*: 103; *118-24*: 103 n. 20; *126ff.*: 101 n. 7; *129.3ff.*: 104 n. 27; *132.13*: 104 n. 24; *136.4ff.*: 101 n. 7; *140*: 101f.; *140.7*: 64 n. 89.

Phaedrus *IV. 1*: 113 n. 67; *App.* 14: 48; *App.* 15: 111 n. 57.

Philostratus, *VA*: 7, 89-94, 106, 115, 118. *I. 4*: 91 n. 85; *5*: 91 n. 86; *6*: 90 n. 70; *7*: 93 n. 105; *16*: 91 nn. 92f.; *20*: 92 n. 100; *24*: 90 nn. 71f. *II. 4*: 90 n. 73; *9*: 90 n. 74; *22*: 90 n. 75, 93 n. 112; *27ff.*: 91 n. 84; *28*: 93 n. 109; *29*: 92 n. 99, 93 n. 113; *39*: 93 n. 107; *43*: 90 n. 74; *III.* 8: 90 n. 80; *18*: 93 n. 114; *19*: 92 n. 97; *22*: 93 n. 115; *23*: 93 n. 116; *24*: 91 n. 87; *25*: 92 nn. 97, 99; *27*: 90 n. 77; *38*: 26 n. 60, 91 n. 88; *45*: 90 n. 81, 91 n. 83, 92 n. 102; *48*: 90 n. 79; *55*: 91 n. 82; *56*: 90 n. 76; *IV. 1*: 91 n. 89; *9*: 93 n. 121; *10*: 26 n. 60, 91 nn. 88, 90; *11-16*: 93 n. 118; *20*: 26 n. 60; *21*: 93 n. 119; *22*: 91 n. 94; *25*: 91 n. 91; *30*: 93 n. 120; *42*: 91 n. 93; *V. 8*: 92 n. 103; *9*: 92 n. 104; *16*: 92 n. 98; *21*: 93 n. 121; *24*: 93 n. 108; *25*: 21; *26*: 92 n. 95; *VI. 4*: 90 n. 78; *10*: 90 n. 76, 92 n. 101; *11*: 93 nn. 121f.; *13*: 90 n. 76, 92 n. 101; *20*: 91 n. 94; *21*: 93 n. 110; *24*: 91 n. 83; *30*: 93 n. 117; *36*: 92 n. 96; *39*:

93 n. 107; *43*: 93 n. 121; *VII. 11*: 93 n. 122; *39*: 91 n. 91; *VIII. 25*: 93 n. 106.

Philostratus, *VS*: 90, 99. *542*: 73 n. 46; *552ff.*: 95 n. 130; *572*: 15 n. 12; *590*: 24 n. 50; *604f.*: 36; *619*: 24 n. 50. *Heroicus*: 6, 95 and n. 131, 96 nn. 133, 137, 118.

Photius: 1f., 7. *Cod. 87*: 110 n. 50; *94*: 7 n. 25, 86 n. 49; *94.74a*: 14 n. 8; *129*: 34 and n. 2, 35, 44ff., 52, 110 n. 50; *166*: 1 n. 2; *166.109b*: 6 n. 24; *166.110a*: 2 n. 6.

Plautus, *Mostellaria*: 25.

Plato: 68, 102. *Phaed. 81E*: 48; *101D*: 60; *Phaedr. 228D*: 22; *250B*: 4; *250C*: 3; *255D*: 86 n. 45; *260*: 46 n. 63; *275B*: 30; *R 359Dff.*: 24 n. 52; *468B*: 13; *614Bff.*: 25, 27; *620Aff.*: 6; *620C*: 48; *621B*: 3; *Theaet. 174A*: 4.

Pliny the Younger: *Ep. VII. 27.4f.*: 28, 53.

Plutarch, *Mor. 14E*: 27 n. 66; *172B*: 17; *241D*: 17; *242B*: 17; *257E*: 63 n. 80; *258f.*: 18; *590F, 592A*: 5; *768B*: 63 n. 80; (Ps. Plut.) *771Eff.*: 12 n. 4. περὶ ψυχῆς, 27.

Porphyry, *Vit. Pythag.*: 1.

Pythagorean Literature: 3-7, 93f.

Seneca, *Apoc.*: 43; *Const. Sap. 2.5*: 105 n. 28; *Marc. 26.4*: 2; *Herc. Fur. 944ff.*: 2.

Sisenna: 111, 113. *Fr. 10 Buecheler*: 47.

Tacitus, *Ann. XVI. 18*: 105.

Theocritus *II*: 112 n. 62.

Theon, *Progymnasmata*, 17 n. 23, 19 n. 33.

Theophrastus, *Char.*: 102 and n. 12. *V. 5*: 28 n. 71; *XXI. 9*: 28 n. 71.

Thucydides, 68.

Valerius Maximus *IV. 7*: 12 n. 4.

Varro, *Marcipor, fgt. 272 Buecheler*, 105 n. 28.

Xenophon of Ephesus: 44 n. 56, 87 n. 51. *II. 8.2*: 47; *IV. 6.1ff.*: 86 n. 47; *6.2ff.*: 86 n. 50; *V. 7.8*: 84 n. 22.

# INDEX OF PROPER NAMES

This list does not include material from the tables on pp. 8f., 22, 32, 40f.


Abauchas, 14, 79
Abdera, 60
Abderites, 92
Abonoteichos, 69; see also Alexander of A.
Acropolis, 102
Actaeon, 53 n. 13, 62
Adimantus, 57, 103
Adonis, 71
Adrastus, 63
Adyrmachus, 18
Aeacus, 25, 27
Aeolocentaur, 10
Agamemnon, 104
Agathion, 95
Agathocles, 54
Alans, 18
Alcidamas, 17, 21
Alcimus, 61
Alexander of Abonoteichos, 2, 14, 18, 28, 38, 57, 64, 68f., 76, 78, 91, 108
Alexander the Great, 17 n. 23, 77, 90f.
Amastris, 14
Amizokes, 13
Amor, 110
Anacharsis, 14, 92, 96f.
Anthea, 47
Antigonus, 31f.
Antioch, 91
Antiochus, 65, 79
Antiphilus, 21, 54, 96
Antipodes, 4
Antoninus Pius, 88
Aphrodite, 76
Apollo, 39, 69 n. 13, 71, 77
Apollonius of Tyana, 7, 26, 89-94
Arabians, 13, 31
Archonides, 18
Aretaeus, 19
Arignotus, 28, 58f.
Aristagoras, 17
Aristomenes, 52, 54f., 110, 114
Aristotle, 56
Arsacomas, 15ff., 62
Artaphernes, 17
Artaxerxes, 17
Artemis, 89
Asclepius, 78 n. 64
Ascyltus, 102, 104
Asia Minor, 17
Aspasia, 40
Asslegs, 24, 48
Astarta-niku, 79 n. 68
Astraeus, 7
Atargatis, 39, 68
Athenians, 96
Athens, 2, 14, 55, 66, 91, 97
Attic, 110
'Attic' decoration, 117 n. 7
Attica, 95
Attis, 80

Babylon, 14, 31, 69
Bagoas, 58, 80
Barbarus, 65, 109ff.
Basthes, 62 n. 72
Belitta, 62 n. 72
Beroia, 36
Boeotia, 95
Bosporus, 16f., 62
Brahmans, 21, 92
Brundisium, 105
Byblos, 76
Byrrhaena, 55

Caesar, 62
Caesarea, 56
Calligone, 16
Candaules, 79 n. 69.
Cantharus, 38, 103
Caspian Sea, 12
Celts, 13
Charicleia, 19, 54, 89 n. 67, 112
Charite, 63, 67
Charito, 21
Charixenus, 19
Charmides, 54
Charon, 92, 95f.
Chiomara, 18
Chloe, 85 n. 40
Chrysis, 25, 29, 54, 112

Cinyras, 4 and n. 13, 76
Circe (Hom.), 24
Circe (Petr.), 101
Cleisophos, 13
Cleisthenes, 17
Cleodemus, 24, 26, 27 n. 70, 31
Cleomenes, 18, 80
Clitophon, 88
Colossus of Memnon, 70
Corcyra, 81
Corinth, 27
Corinthians, 91
Croesus, 19 n. 33
Cronos, 77
Croton, 103
Cupid, 29, 37
Cybele, 74, 80
Cyclops, 63, 85, 104
Cynegirus, 61
Cynic (themes and treatment), 72, 95, 98, 101, 102f.
Cypselus, 21
Cyrus, 69

Daedalus, 93
Damon, 19
Damylus, 27 n. 70
Danae, 88
Danaids, 29, 78
Dandamis, 13, 79
Darius, 15, 79
Deinias, 4, 19, 54, 112
Delphi, 76
Demainete, 32
Demetrius, 21, 54
Demochares, 4, 64
Demonax, 4, 91, 112
Demylus, 27 n. 70
Derceto, 76
Dercyllis, 7
Deucalion, 70
Dialogue, 60, 92
Diana, 53 n. 13
Dionysus, 74f., 77, 80, 84 n. 10, 90
Diophanes, 56f.
Dreamland (Isle of Dreams), 8 n. 30, 10 and n. 31, 69
Drimylus, 27 n. 70
Drunkenness, 60

Egypt, 15, 21, 26, 36, 93
Egyptians, 28, 30, 53, 56, 75f., 82, 92, 110

Elysium, 5
Empedocles, 26
Empousa, 24, 90
Encolpius, 100-104
Endymion, 3, 13
Enkidu, 79
Ephesus, 91
Er, 27
Eretrians, 90
Eridanus (Po), 15 n. 11, 92, 97
Eros, 28, 85, 88 and n. 61
Ethiopians, 39
Euboea, 61, 95, 98
Euboeans, 95ff.
Eubiotos, 16, 18
Eucrates, 4 n. 13, 21, 25-33, 55, 69, 75, 90
Eucritus, 4 n. 13
Eudamidas, 19f.
Eudemus, 58
Eumolpus, 43, 64, 101ff.
Euphrates, 92
Europa, 75, 88
Euthydicus, 19

Fotis, 60

Gadeirans, 92
Gaius, brother of Lucius, 40
Galatea, 97
Ganymede, 85 n. 40, 88, 97
Garamantes, 15 n. 15
Gaul, 36
Gindanes, 15
Giton, 100ff.
Gyndanes, 80, 82
Glaucias, 25, 29, 54, 112
Glycon, 69, 85 n. 24, 108
Gnathon, 107
Greece, 95
Greeks (as opposed to Scythians), 12-23, 61, 66, 116; (as opposed to other foreigners), 30, 64, 90, 92
Gyges, 24, 79, 117

Habrocomas, 46
Hades, 7f., 10 n. 31, 18, 24-27, 31f., 45, 60, 92
Hecate, 31, 76, 84, 90
Helen, 4 n. 13, 75f.
Heliopolis, 76
Hellenodikai, 93
Hephaestus, 25, 29

Heracles, 2, 18, 71, 75 (Greek and Tyrian), 90ff.
Hera, 56, 69, 71, 74f., 77, 88
Hermes, 18, 25, 27, 29, 59f., 71, 77, 95
Hermocles of Rhodes, 80f.
Hermotimus, 57, 80
Hesiod, 6
Hierapolis, 68ff., 72 n. 40, 73, 100
Hippocleides, 17
Hippolytus, 66
Histiaeus of Miletus, 17
Homer, 6, 93
Humbaba, 79 n. 68, 80
Hymettus, 110
Hypata, 36
Hyperattic jargon, 43
Hyperboreans, 5, 26, 30f., 69, 91

Icarus, 93
India, 2, 30, 60, 90ff.
Indians, 15 n. 11, 92
Indopatres, 16 n. 20
Intaphernes, 14, 15 n. 11, 79
Io, 64, 77
Iolaus, 107
Ion, 17
Ionians, 17
Ionic, 43, 73, 78
Ionopolis, 69
Ipola, 92
Isis (goddess), 46
Isis (ship), 19
Isles of the Blest, 5f., 10 n. 31, 27, 70, 90
Isthmus of Corinth, 110

Julia Domna, 89, 94
Juno, 64, 74
Jupiter, 13, 64
Justice, 92

Kamma, 63
Kombabos, 65, 69, 78ff., 107, 113
Kombaphis, 80

Lamptown, see Lychnopolis
Lamachus, 61
Larissa, 36
Latin, 110
Leucanor, 15f., 18
Libya, 30, 36, 90
Libyans, 14f., 78
Lichas, 102ff.
Lonchates, 15, 17f., 62
Lucian (as character), 4
Lucius, 34-67, 100f., 107
Lychnopolis (Lamptown), 8 n. 30, 10 and n. 31
Lycinus, 6, 22, 56f., 72, 87, 103
Lydians, 30
Lysistrata, 113

Macedonia, 36, 48
Macedonians, 20, 73
Macentes, 17f.
Machlyes, 15
Malea, 93
Maltese, 27f.
Mandane, 2
Marathon, 62
Marseilles, see Massilia
Massagetae, 69
Massilia, 20, 62
Mausacus, 52
Mazaea, 16, 18, 86
Media, 90
Megapenthes, 55, 102
Melanippus, 21
Melissa, 25, 27
Memnon, 21
Menecles, 38
Menecrates, 19ff.
Metapontum, 91
Menippus, 6, 26f., 45, 102
Micio, 18
Micyllus, 40, 102
Midas, 48 n. 76
Milo, 51
Misenus, 103 n. 17
Mnesippus, 13, 19ff., 52f.
Moeris, Lake, 71 n. 40, 77
Myrmex, 65, 109ff.

Neo-Pythagoreans, 91
Nero, 92
Nephelokentauroi, 3
Nephelokokkygia, 10 n. 31
Nereid-harpies, 90
Niceros, 111f., 114
Nigrinus, 22 n. 40, 91
Nile, 21, 84 n. 18
Nisibis, 89 n. 67
North Italy, 30

Odysseus, 85, 93, 104

Ogmios, 71 and n. 36
Olympians (gods), 39; (inhabitants), 92
Oresteium, 71
Orestes, 53 n. 13
Osiris, 69
Othryades, 14

Pachrates, see Pancrates
Palaestra, 37, 100, 113
Palamedes, 93
Palinurus, 103 n. 17
Pan, 84 n. 10, 96, 102
Pancrates, 25, 28f. and n. 76, 33
Pannychis, 101
Pantarbe, 91
Panthea, 87, 94
Paphlagonians, 26
Parrhesiades, 70
Paris, 85 n. 40
Patroclus, 28
Pellichus, 26, 69, 77
Peregrinus, 21, 26, 39, 91, 93
Periander, 21, 25, 27
Perilaus, 39
Peripatetics, 56
Persia, 2, 15, 81
Persians, 84
Phaethon, 71
Phalaris, 21, 39, 62 and n. 73
Phellopodes, 10
Philematium, 54
Philip of Macedon, 13, 20
Philippopolis, 36, 40
Philomela, 77
Philosophy, 92
Phoenicia, 76
Phoenicians, 75, 95
Plato, 6, 26
Po, see Eridanus
Polemo (philosopher), 60; (sophist), 73 n. 46
Polycrates, 15 n. 11, 19 n. 33
Polyphemus, 97
Priapus, 100
Proteus, 91
Providence, 57, 74
Psammenitus, 14
Psyche, 110, 113
Pylades, 53 n. 13
Pythagoras, 6, 28, 38, 40, 48, 75, 78, 91
Pythagoreans, 4
Pythagoreanism, 5ff.
Pytheas, 55

Quartilla, 99, 101

Rhampsinitus, 61
Rhea, 28
Rhetoric, 60, 92
Risus-festival, 59ff., 67
Romans, 40 n. 44, 58ff., 64, 92, 102f.
Rome, 91, 103

St. Elmo's fire, 10
Samippus, 117
Samos, 81
Samosata, 36
Sardanapallus, 77
Sarmatians, see Sauromatae
Saturnalia, 60
Satyrus, 20
Sauromatae (Sarmatians), 13, 16, 18
Scintharus, 4f., 17f.
Scythia, 2, 4, 12-19, 30, 36
Scythians, 2, 4f., 12-23, 53 n. 13, 61f., 71f., 82, 96, 107
Sea of Milk, 5
Selenites, 73, 80, 82
Semiramis, 48 n. 70, 77
Septimius Severus, 89
Sesostris, 15
Sidon, 75
Sithuthes, 71 n. 30
Silenus, 26
Sinaetes, 17
Sinorix, 63
Sirens, 24
Smyrna, 91
Socrates, 30; (friend of Aristomenes), 54f.
Sostratus, 95 n. 130
Solon, 92
Sotiani, 13
Sparta, 91
Spartans, 17
Stratonice, 65, 70, 71 n. 39, 79, 113
Strepsiades, 3
Stoics, 57, 74
Styx, 26, 92
Sybaritic tales, 112
Syrian goddess, see Atargatis
Syrians, 26, 30f., 73, 76, 81f.

Taenarus, 110

Talus the Cretan, 55
Tartarus, 10
Temperance, 92
Tereus, 77
Thersander, 88
Thersites, 93
Thelyphron, 52, 57ff., 110
Thessaly, 34-37
Thessalian tales, 112
Thessalonica, 36
Thrace, 36
Thrasyleon, 61
Thrasyllus, 63
Tibeius, 18
Tigrapates, 16
Timocles, 74, 81, 104
Timolaus, 17, 24, 117 and n. 8
Timon, 60, 63 and n. 77
Tlepolemus, 61 n. 68, 63 and n. 77
Toxaris, 14, 16f., 21f., 52, 58, 64, 80, 97
Trimalchio, 43, 102
Troad, 6, 95
Trojan horse, 62
Troy, 75
Trygaeus, 3
Tyana, 90
Tychiades, 33, 54
Tyrian Heracles, 75

Utopia, 6, 93

War, 3
Widow of Ephesus, 111, 113

Xenophon, (servant), 18

Zenothemis, 19f.
Zeus, 4, 26, 55f., 69, 77, 81, 88 and n. 61
Zeus Belus, 69, 70
Zeus Olympios, 76 n. 39
Zopyrus, 59, 79

# STUDIES IN LUCIAN'S COMIC FICTION

BY

GRAHAM ANDERSON

LUGDUNI BATAVORUM E. J. BRILL MCMLXXVI